

Appendix 2: Draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document – summary of consultation responses

Draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document – summary of consultation responses

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
1.	Nottinghamshire County Council	General	<u>Policy & Strategic Context</u> The SPD must align with Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (Policy 31). This new policy will form the basis for ongoing development and given its advanced state, the SPD should reflect its provisions.	An SPD must be prepared in support of adopted development plan policies. In the case of the site, the main adopted policy is policy 25 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy. The draft policy 31 does, however, broadly roll forward this policy. It is therefore considered that the SPD is in general conformity with the emerging policy.
2.	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	General	Requests the SPD is not adopted before the new Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP) so as to avoid contradictions	The GNSP still requires scrutiny at examination which can be a lengthy process. The SPD is due to be adopted ahead of the GNSP. The need to maintain sufficient housing land supply means it would be inappropriate to delay the SPD until the GNSP process has been completed.
3.	Notts County Council (Property)	General	The aspirations set out in the draft SPD do not appear to have been evidenced to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of adopted local plan Policy 25 along with Emerging Policy 31 of the Greater Nottinghamshire Strategic Plan. The draft SPD fails to set out a comprehensive strategy for the delivery of the SUE in terms of infrastructure provision, phasing arrangements or design. The requirements of the draft SPD may also make the quantum of required development set out in	This is not accepted. The purpose of the SPD is to provide a high-level framework to enable the delivery of a site with a number of landowners. The SPD sets out that the determination of more detailed mitigation requirements, together with their delivery are matters for the proposed Infrastructure Delivery Plan and planning applications and their associated S106 agreements.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>the allocation unachievable. it</p> <p>The SPD appears too prescriptive and policy based which is not appropriate in SPD which sits outside of the adopted Development Plan. This could result in the document being vulnerable to a legal challenge.</p>	
4.	Notts County Council (Property)	General	<p>Alongside the SPD there needs to be essential site wide documents that should be an obligation on all landowners/ developers to ensure cohesive delivery of the SUE and secure land value parity between owners through gross equalisation principles</p>	<p>It is agreed that such documents would be of assistance but those such as collaboration or equalisation agreements are beyond the control of the Council to produce. The delivery of the site is going to need cooperation between the main landowners and developers.</p>
5.	Notts County Council (Property)	General	<p>A number of detailed comments are set out in various detailed aspects of the SPD.</p>	<p>In most cases, the points are either not accepted, they are adequately addressed already by the SPD or the details will follow as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for the site and/or as part of the planning application process.</p>
6.	Notts County Council (Property)	General	<p>There are fundamental conflicts between SPD and two pending planning applications</p>	<p>If there are conflicts between the SPD and the two pending planning applications, then this is a matter for the planning application process.</p>
7.	Resident 139	General	<p>Suggests development does not conform with the NPPF as it overconcentrates growth in West Bridgford</p>	<p>The growth strategy set out in the local plan establishes that development will primarily occur within or adjacent to the primary urban area. The SPD broadly establishes what new facilities should be provided as part of this</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				development to ensure the amenities of surrounding neighbourhoods are not negatively impacted.
8.	Resident 2 Resident 4 Resident 5 Resident 8 Resident 9 Resident 10 Resident 11 Resident 12 Resident 13 Resident 17 Resident 20 Resident 21 Resident 26 Resident 30 Resident 33 Resident 34 Resident 37 Resident 41 Resident 42 Resident 44 Resident 47 Resident 63 Resident 64 Resident 85 Resident 109 Resident 110 Resident 115 Resident 122	General	Object to principle of development on the site	The principle of development on the site has been established through the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014)

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 223 Resident 269 Regional and Business Airport Group Electric Aviation Maven Ltd			
9.	Resident 205	General	Concern over loss of Green Belt land	The site is not located within the Green Belt.
10.	Resident 212	General	There are sufficient Brownfield sites in our towns & cities, where the necessary housing could be built without creeping further into Green Belt and/or the rural fringes to our towns & cities. If this development has to go ahead however, then the SPD appears to be a quite good starting point - especially if the Council holds to its principles and does insist that nothing will be allowed to progress if it is not in total alignment with the SPD.	The need and suitability for development of the site have already been established through the Local Plan process. The Council acknowledges the support for the provisions made in the SPD.
11.	Resident 213 Resident 214 Resident 215 Resident 219	General	Object to closure of airport. Concern aviation and other bodies not consulted. Bodies are listed. Consider wider public debate regarding its closure and sale.	The airport was closed by the site owners as its operation is not compatible with development of housing in the vicinity. The Council had no control over this decision.
12.	Resident 245 Resident 265 Resident 271	General	Concerned applications have been progressed before SPD adoption	The Council cannot control when applications are submitted and has a responsibility to determine applications put to it in a timely manner. The applications on the site have yet to be determined and the Council has made

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				clear its view that the SPD should be adopted prior to the determination of planning applications in order to inform any decision.
13.	Resident 25	General	Concern that building new homes is being prioritised over filling empty ones	Meeting housing needs is dependent on both new housing and minimising the extent of existing empty homes. The Council's empty homes strategy is available to read at: https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/about-us/about-the-Council/policies-strategies-and-other-documents/accessible-documents/empty-homes-strategy-2024-2029/#seven
14.	Resident 42	General	Suggests housing need could be met without significant road impact through development at Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) site R12.3 south of Wheatcroft island	All major housing development generates road impact. Further SHLAA sites will be considered for allocation as part of future local plan-making.
15.	Resident 43 Resident 157 Resident 162 Resident 164 Resident 167 Resident 169 Resident 175 Resident 179 Resident 183 Resident 186 Resident 187 Resident 188 Resident 189 Resident 192	General	Concern that the proposed allocation of 4,000 homes is excessive and will significantly alter the character of the area.	The scale of development has been established through the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014), which directs most growth to locations in or adjoining the Nottingham urban area. This approach reduces pressure on smaller settlements and ensures housing need is met alongside delivery of schools, healthcare, green infrastructure and transport improvements. The SPD sets out design principles and mitigation measures to manage the impact of development and create a sustainable, well-planned community.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 193 Resident 231 Resident 241			
16.	Resident 75	General	Suggests development scale is in conflict with local plan spatial strategy and that it should be treated as a Strategic Growth Location with associated sustainability appraisal.	The scale of development on the site is established through the 2014 Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy. The spatial strategy directs strategic development to areas adjoining the built-up area of Nottingham at sites including east of Gamston/north of Tollerton, Melton Road Edwalton and South of Clifton. It is being treated as a strategic site allocated for significant residential and employment; supported by new facilities including education and neighbourhood centres. Sustainability appraisal has been undertaken both through its initial allocation and the production of the emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.
17.	Coal Authority	General	The Coal Authority is satisfied that there are no coal mining features present on the site	The Council acknowledges the confirmation from The Coal Authority
18.	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	General	Concern there is no reference to a sitewide EIA despite its scale. Request sitewide EIA or environmental statement for the site.	The EIA requirements for the site are the subject to separate legal and regulatory requirements and cannot be directed by the SPD.
19.	Resident 163	General	Supports the SPD in principle.	The support is noted.
20.	Resident 179 Resident 182 Resident 192	General	Concern over loss of airfield and businesses.	The airfield is no longer in operation, apart from currently its use by Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Air Ambulance helicopters.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 195 Resident 199 Resident 205 Resident 211 Resident 221 Resident 240			<p>The SPD needs to be updated to reflect this change in circumstances and its implications. For example, there is no longer a need to refer to the requirement for the airfield to close before the first occupation of new housing on site. However, as helicopters are continuing to use a small part of the airfield site, the SPD still needs to refer to potential for restrictions on first occupation of new homes in the vicinity until this use of the site ceases.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Update paragraph 3.54, plus paragraphs 2.7 (transport infrastructure), 3.68 and 4.6 to reflect the change in circumstances in respect of use of the airfield and the implications of this.</p>
21.	Resident 201	General	Development on higher ground will ruin the aspect of the Grantham Canal and Bassingfield	There will be mitigations in the form of strengthened green infrastructure along the canal.
22.	Resident 223	General	Concern there were no members of the Council staff present at consultation events	Rushcliffe Borough Council's Planning Policy team attended the consultation event and answered questions from those who attended.
23.	Resident 286	General	Questions how split ownership affects the SPD, specifically the portion of the site owned by the City Council which is not already purchased.	One of the roles of the SPD is to help support and encourage delivery of a large site that is in the control of multiple landowners and developers.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
24.	Resident 43 Resident 169	General	Requests clearer timelines for development of strategic infrastructure including road improvements and pedestrian and cycle access over the A52 as well as consultation with residents over route safety concerns.	Timelines for development depend on a multitude of factors, so it is difficult to be prescriptive as to what will happen when. The SPD establishes the broad infrastructure requirements, and more details about what and when will be established subsequently at the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and planning application stages (including within section 106 legal agreements). In respect of those planning applications already received, there is expected to be a further round of consultation on transport related details.
25.	Tollerton Parish Council Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council Resident 43 Resident 130 Resident 138 Resident 226 Resident 234 Resident 236 Resident 237 Resident 245 Resident 247 Resident 249 Resident 254 Resident 260 Resident 266	General	Concerns inaccuracies/ inconsistencies in the document make it hard to understand and leave loopholes for developers to exploit	Any errors identified have been corrected throughout the document.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 274 Resident 275 Resident 281 Resident 282 Resident 285 Resident 286			
26.	Tollerton Parish Council	General	SPD is uninspiring and too flexible. Leaves the door open for poor quality development	This is not accepted. The SPD will help to ensure that a high standard of development, supported by necessary infrastructure, is delivered on the site.
27.	Tollerton Parish Council	General	Lack of consideration of existing dwellings and residents within allocation.	<p>These are matters that will be considered at the planning stage once detailed design and layout are known. In accordance with Local Plan policy requirements, residential amenity will be a consideration as part of any planning application to avoid negative impacts on existing residents.</p> <p>The SPD at paragraph 3.60 identifies that existing properties (residential dwellings on Tollerton Lane, the Park Homes site) and Hospital building (amongst others) should remain and be protected at part of any development proposals.</p>
28.	Tollerton Parish Council Resident 31 Resident 43 Resident 57 Resident 70	General	Objects to the omission of the Tollerton Neighbourhood plan from the SPD document.	It is agreed that the SPD should refer to the importance of the Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan and the fact that it forms part of the development plan for the area covering the site.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 76 Resident 83 Resident 87 Resident 88 Resident 89 Resident 98 Resident 116 Resident 117 Resident 118 Resident 120 Resident 121 Resident 128 Resident 129 Resident 137 Resident 142 Resident 144 Resident 147 Resident 149 Resident 151 Resident 208 Resident 211 Resident 219 Resident 220 Resident 222 Resident 236 Resident 237 Resident 239 Resident 242 Resident 245 Resident 250 Resident 252			<p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Include after paragraph 1.36 a new paragraph highlighting the importance of the Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 262 Resident 266 Resident 268 Resident 273 Resident 275 Resident 277 Resident 283 Resident 287			
29.	Notts County Council (Property) Resident 120 Resident 143 Resident 152 Resident 207 Resident 213 Resident 215 Resident 216 Resident 222 Resident 234 Resident 239 Resident 245 Resident 254 Resident 255 Resident 257 Resident 262 Resident 282 Resident 287	General – procedure	Concern the consultation period was shorter than on other documents, included a school holiday and in person consultation was held at Gamston and not Tollerton.	The consultation took place over 5 weeks which is above the statutory minimum. In addition to making the consultation documents available online and providing the ability to talk to Council planning officers by telephone, an in-person consultation event was held to offer local residents and others the opportunity to talk to officers face-to-face about the document. Gamston Community Hall was considered appropriate for the event as it has parking, public transport connections and is also close to the development site. The consultation prompted lots of engagement from the community and the coincidence with an autumn half-term holiday is unlikely to have negatively impacted this.
30.	Resident 142	General – procedure	Concern that objections may not be given due diligence	The object of consultation is to establish what further issues need to be considered in the

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				development and changes are made to the draft document where appropriate in response to comments made.
31.	Resident 257	General – procedure	Concerned Cotgrave residents were not notified by post as with Tollerton and Gamston	Cotgrave is not within the immediate vicinity of the site. There was significant publicity of the consultation via email and in local media.
32.	Resident 57	General – procedure	Concern consultation documents did not meet equality act requirements as there were not brail documents accessible to visually impaired individuals.	The SPD was made available online in a format specifically accessible to screen readers.
33.	Tollerton Parish Council Resident 18	General – procedure	Objects to Tollerton Parish Council not being involved in preparation of the SPD	Rushcliffe Borough Council has prepared the SPD as it considers appropriate. The Parish Council has had the opportunity to comment on the draft SPD.
34.	Cllr Richard Butler Resident 37 Resident 55 Resident 77 Resident 83 Resident 87 Resident 98 Resident 116 Resident 121 Resident 129 Resident 132 Resident 139 Resident 142 Resident 223	General – procedure	Concern that developers were involved in production of the SPD. Suggests that developer involvement and agreement on outcomes is counter to planning authority's statutory duties.	The major developers have been able to suggest content for the draft SPD, but such contributions have only been included with the agreement of Council officers. Such collaborative working between the Council and interested developers is commonplace in relation to the production of emerging SPDs in England. Council officers were clear that the development and production of a consultation draft of the SPD was to be undertaken by the Council objectively with review and evolution being undertaken independently of the developers and that public consultation and feedback would then be required to progress the SPD further; when all responses would be

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 233 Resident 234 Resident 239 Resident 245 Resident 253 Resident 254 Resident 257 Resident 262 Resident 273 Resident 285 Resident 286			considered and taken into account. Good practice guidance published by the Local Government Association reinforces the benefits of such joint working: see https://www.local.gov.uk/publications/effective-delivery-strategic-sites-accessible-version
35.	Resident 222	General – procedure	Planning law guidance states that you are required to be impartial, consider public interest and there must be a clear separation between the applicant and decision maker.	There is nothing in planning law to prevent landowners and developers collaborating with local planning authorities on the preparation of SPDs. Good practice guidance published by the Local Government Association reinforces this (see https://www.local.gov.uk/publications/effective-delivery-strategic-sites-accessible-version)
36.	Active Travel England	General	National Guidance Welcome reference to <i>Building for a Healthy Life</i> ; developers should be required to submit their own BHL assessments. Add reference to Active Design (Sport England/ATE guidance). Promote aspiration for BHL Commendation (nine green lights).	To require a Building for a Healthy Life assessment as part of planning applications would require a change in local plan policy. It would not be appropriate to insist upon this through the SPD. Reference is already included in a number of places to the Active Design guidance.
37.	Cllr Steve Calvert	General	Questions what the pipeline carries	The pipeline is currently decommissioned and does not carry anything.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
38.	East Midlands Pipeline	General	Requests the contact details of developers on the site and that EMP be notified of relevant planning applications and consulted in a timely manner.	The main site promoters have published contact details on their respective websites and details of the agents for the existing planning applications are available on the Council's online planning application system (https://planningon-line.rushcliffe.gov.uk/online-applications/). Anyone can register their interest in planning applications via this online system.
39.	Resident 102	General	Objects to application to build housing on land off Burnside Grove.	The application for development off Burnside Grove is not subject to this SPD.
40.	Resident 122	General	Suggests the development of a vertiport on the site would be more beneficial for the area.	The site is required to meet the Borough's housing need.
41.	Resident 126	General	Highlights incorrect references to figures in the document.	Any incorrect references to figures identified have been corrected.
42.	Resident 130 Resident 226 Resident 281	General	Concerns over quality of maps and keys, request these are in better resolution.	There is a trade-off to be made between the resolution of documents and their file size when viewing them online. The adopted SPD will also be made available to view online and download as separate chapters in order provide a higher resolution version of the SPD, but also to ensure file sizes are not unduly large.
43.	Resident 130	General	Requests review of figures to clarify "edge treatments" will not extend beyond the site boundary.	As potentially some mitigation measures could extend beyond the site's boundary, rather than make changes to these particular figures to

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<p>exclude land falling outside the site, it is more appropriate to clarify that nothing related to the development will happen on land outside or inside the site without the full consent of the landowner.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Include after paragraph 4.33 a new paragraph which states that nothing related to the development will happen on land inside or outside the boundary of the development site without the full consent of the landowner.</p>
44.	Resident 133	General	Concern visible transmission aerials will detract from the countryside.	Applications for aerials will be assessed against their impact on visual amenity as is standard procedure.
45.	Resident 133	General	Concern there will not be sufficient space for wheelie bins on each property and that people will store these on the street	Full planning applications will be required to demonstrate there is sufficient space to store bins on the property curtilage. It will be down to property owners to manage their bins.
46.	Resident 144	General	Concerned the SPD does not mention new footpaths and infrastructure mentioned in the emerging GNSP	The GNSP is an emerging document which has not yet been tested at examination. It would therefore not be appropriate to reference its infrastructure requirements within the SPD, where these are not part of existing development plan requirements.
47.	Resident 146	General	Queries the legal implication and liabilities were the development to result in health and safety issues as a direct result of negligence during the planning process	This is not a matter for the SPD. It is understood that local authorities would generally not be liable in respect of such matters. However, issues in respect of

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				particular cases might be a matter for the courts to resolve.
48.	Resident 149 Resident 206 Resident 207 Resident 211	General	The submitted SPD and plans contain multiple inconsistencies and internal contradictions, including conflicts with the adopted neighbourhood plan. These discrepancies must be addressed and resolved prior to any further progression of the application to ensure the integrity and reliability of the documentation.	The draft SPD is not considered to contradict the Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan.
49.	Resident 168 Resident 193	General	Concern that policing and community safety for a large new community will be insufficient, with an inherent risk of increased crime.	Although policing arrangements are not directly within the scope of the SPD, the document requires proposals to be assessed against “Secured by Design” principles to promote community safety. This includes measures such as natural surveillance, active frontages, and well-designed public spaces.
50.	Resident 201	General	Document is too detailed to provide a simple guide for comments for residents	The document is as detailed as it needs to be in order to appropriately guide development and provide the right planning tool for use in the determination of planning applications. Summary information in respect of the draft SPD was made available to members of the public and others as part of its consultation.
51.	Resident 203 Resident 226	General	Concern over tall buildings impacting on the light of existing residents, privacy from overlooking existing dwellings and gardens	These are matters that will be considered at the detailed planning stage once detailed designs and layouts are known. In accordance with Local Plan policy requirements, residential amenity will be a consideration as part of any

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				full planning applications to avoid negative impact on existing residents.
52.	Resident 219	General	Some of the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) are missing from the plans	Those relevant to the SPD are shown.
53.	Resident 226	General	Concern over the developers' abilities to project manage the development as a whole.	The developers have significant experience project managing and will assume those responsibilities for their own applications within the site. The Council will continue to engage with the developers on a regular basis to monitor delivery.
54.	Resident 226	General	Requests acronyms are written in full when they are first used.	This has been done where possible.
55.	Resident 226	General	Questions why figure 4 shows two areas of employment development.	Figure 4 is taken from the 2014 Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy. It was the indicative layout for the site at that time but, following the more detailed master planning process undertaken in the period since then, the overall site layout has legitimately changed.
56.	Resident 246	General	Concerned there is no mention of energy efficient housing.	Requirements for high energy efficiency and domestic energy production in new homes are set out in Policy 2: 'Climate Change' of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy. This applies to all development in the borough.
57.	Resident 37	General	Figures are out of date as they do not show recent developments in Cotgrave	The figures specified are location plans to demonstrate where the site is and are effective in doing this.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
58.	Resident 41	General	Suggests the site should provide industrial sites leisure activities and re-naturalisation as with Rushcliffe Country Park	Such uses are in principle appropriate on site, alongside the overriding need for housing development.
59.	Resident 62 Resident 65	General	Concern that there is lack of joined up working from different bodies and levels of government and that there is not a coherent masterplan.	<p>Production of the SPD document has engaged with various actors and stakeholders to create guidance on what the masterplan should achieve. Specifically, the masterplan framework establishes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General location of homes and employment land - Location of schools, neighbourhood centres and healthcare facilities - Phasing requirements will be established in more detail in the IDP - Shared contributions to essential infrastructure (generally what costs will be shared across all developers and what will be covered individually) <p>It helps sets expectations as to what will be acceptable when development phases are delivered.</p>
60.	Resident 7 Resident 162 Resident 166	General	Concerns over the proportion of the site to be built over, suggests development be focused on one side of Tollerton Lane.	Development on both sides of Tollerton Lane will be necessary to accommodate the scale of residential development required.
61.	Resident 75	General	Requests consideration of a steering group for the development comprising developers, local authority and residents to ensure adherence to the design objectives. Suggests forum could	The Council as local planning authority is responsible for judging planning applications against local and national policies and (once adopted) the SPD, including its design

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			naturally lead into the referenced stewardship working group	objectives; adherence will be monitored by the Council and its planning enforcement team.
62.	Resident 75	General	Request developers prove success in delivering similar high-quality mixed-use schemes and be held to standards of other specified schemes across the country. Requests clear control mechanisms to hold developers to design standards. Concern over inclusion of three-story properties.	The Council has no control over who develops the site. The purpose of the SPD's production is to help set out a standard for development to be held to. Once adopted the SPD will become a material consideration when assessing all planning applications on the site. The site includes development of education, employment and community uses, therefore warranting denser housing than generally seen in the rural part of the borough to ensure the best possible access to these new facilities.
63.	Resident 84 Resident 198	General	Concern that the scale of development is too large and the proposed infrastructure will not be able to support it. Suggests allocation of a smaller development with more robust infrastructure	The location and scale of development have been established by the adopted Rushcliffe Local Plan. The SPD's preparation will help ensure that development is adequately supported by new or improved infrastructure. The infrastructure planned and contributions to off-site infrastructure will be brought forward in cooperation with relevant highways and transport, education and utility bodies.
64.	Tollerton Parish Council	General	Request green buffer depth is specified along with the landscape structure and management arrangements	Rather than applying an arbitrary minimum width, the depth of the green buffer will be informed by ecological assessment of the site, the need to provide biodiversity net gain (BNG) and the need to landscape development.
65.	Resident 19 Resident 52	General – air ambulance	Concerns over provision for air ambulance which currently uses the site	An alternative location will ultimately need to be found for use by the air ambulance. The

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 114 Resident 121 Resident 127 Resident 132 Resident 133 Resident 142 Resident 222 Resident 244 Resident 246 Resident 253 Resident 262 Resident 265 Resident 271 Resident 277 Resident 282			Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Air Ambulance is aware that this is the case, due to the site's allocation for development, and it is taking steps to find an alternative site.
66.	Resident 179	General - Canal	Concern that the Canal Trust's intention to reopen the canal to boats and install new bridges will create additional challenges for the Trust and potentially conflict with the development.	The SPD recognises the importance of the Grantham Canal as a heritage and ecological asset and supports enhancements to its corridor. Proposals for canal restoration, including navigation and new bridges, fall outside the direct scope of the SPD. The SPD requires that development adjacent to the canal respect its setting, its heritage importance and enhances its role as a green corridor, thereby ensuring that development does not prejudice the Trust's long-term objectives.
67.	Resident 75	General – canal	Suggests the document is unclear as to what will be delivered by way of enhancement at the Grantham Canal.	Specific interventions including tree and hedgerow planting as well as maintenance of the existing greenery along the canal will come

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			Requests there be an enforceable minimum set back distance from the canal to new houses.	forward through planning applications. Most of the water attenuation basins planned for the site are also along this northern edge and therefore being prescriptive about the dimensions of landscaping at this stage of development may impact how effectively these can be delivered.
68.	Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council	General - healthcare	Request reference to the new NHS 10 Year Plan	This is a more strategic level document and arguably of more limited use in informing healthcare or wellbeing requirements for the site. Healthcare requirements are appropriately guided by advice from NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board.
69.	Resident 276	General - healthcare	The text on healthcare provision also needs updating for the NHS '10 Year Health Plan for England: fit for the future' and the move to a neighbourhood health service. Will the currently stated healthcare building requirements be adequate?	This is a more strategic level document and arguably of more limited use in informing healthcare or wellbeing requirements for the site. Healthcare requirements are appropriately guided by advice from NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board.
70.	Resident 245	General – healthcare	Concerned there is no engagement with the NHS on delivery of new healthcare	The NHS (specifically the NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board) is a statutory planning consultee and has therefore been made aware of the plans to deliver significant new housing on the site several times since its allocation in 2014. The NHS facilities outlined in the SPD are calculated using the NHS's metric and as such are in line with what they would anticipate providing for at this level of growth.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
71.	Cllr Steve Calvert	1.9 Purpose and Role of This SPD	Concern over suggestion there will be a "Degree of flexibility" in the design of detailed proposals.	Supplementary Planning documents are made to inform and supplement how policy is implemented not to create new policy. Due to this, and given the scale, complexity and longevity of development, it is necessary to have a degree of flexibility in how the development is delivered.
72.	Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council Resident 130	1.17 Allocation and Context	There is a need to correct the south-eastern boundary. The site follows the Polser Brook yet para 1.17 talks about Thurlbeck Dyke. This should be changed to Polser Brook. As Greenbelt policy requires defensible boundaries to ensure no coalescence any development in this area needs to be set well back from the boundary to achieve this goal.	<p>The reference to Thurlbeck Dyke is an error and needs correcting. Also, the text at paragraph 1.17 needs amending to make clear that the Green Belt boundary changes have already happened (in 2014). The proposals within the SPD identify some set back of development from the boundary.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>At paragraph 1.17, change text as follows: "Based on the work to review the Green Belt when the site was allocated in the Rushcliffe Local Plan, there <u>is</u> <u>was</u> justification for the new boundary to be formed using elements of the Grantham Canal, <u>Thurlbeck Dyke-local watercourses</u> and field and other boundaries to the north of Tollerton. This <u>will achieve</u> <u>achieves</u> a suitable degree of separation between the development and the existing settlement.'</p>
73.	Cllr Steve Calvert	Introduction 1.24	Request realistic dates for home completions.	The text at 1.24 simply describes the requirements of Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy policy 25. The trajectory for housing

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				completions year by year on site is updated annually as part of the Council's housing land monitoring process.
74.	Resident 13 Resident 145	1.41 Secured By Design	Concerns about potential for anti-social behaviour	The SPD highlights that applications will be assessed against the design guides produced in conjunction with the police that aim to provide safe places to live, work, shop and visit.
75.	Cllr Steve Calvert	2.12 Phasing and delivery	Questions whether the Strategic Infrastructure Plan is the same as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Asks for clearer indication as to which planning applications are "significant" and will necessitate S106.	<p>The text included at paragraph 2.12, including reference to the Strategic Infrastructure Plan, has been included in error and should be deleted. Paragraphs 2.14 and 2-15 also needs updating to provide clarity that the completion and publication of the IDP will follow adoption of the SPD.</p> <p>What is deemed significant (referring to the text at paragraph 2.16) is a matter of judgement but for residential schemes it will be those of 10 dwellings or more, for which national policy allows planning obligation to be sought where necessary.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Delete paragraph 2.12 and amend paragraphs 2.14 and 2.15 to clarity that the completion and publication of the IDP will follow adoption of the SPD.</p>
76.	Resident 85 Resident 118	3.13 Landscape	Concerned the document suggests bunds may be allowed instead of green	What is established in the SPD is that along the southern edge of the site, planting of new

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 211 Resident 220 Resident 236 Resident 237 Resident 239 Resident 246 Resident 250 Resident 275 Resident 283	and Visual Context	infrastructure improvements along southern edge of development.	<p>hedgerow and trees like those already seen in the area will strengthen the visual and landscape separation between the two settlements. It is also established that land use within the buffers should have the aim of maintaining the character of the landscape. It is stated that bunds and other manmade earthworks that would raise the land would not meet that objective and will only be permitted where these are necessary to mitigate impacts from development such as run off. It could be made more explicit that this would be by exception.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>At paragraph 3.13 change 'Such features will only be considered by the Council...' to 'Such features will only be considered by the Council by exception...'</p>
77.	Resident 121 Resident 126	3.14 Local Built Character	Concerned none of the pictures of built heritage are houses in Tollerton village. Other images of built heritage depict properties in Lady Bay, West Bridgford and Gamston.	The top left image on page 26 is a house on Tollerton Lane.
78.	Cllr Steve Calvert	3.23 Contamination	Requests community approval on the scope of any contamination assessment	The assessment process for potential contamination will be determined based on appropriate technical standards and processes. The scope of any assessment is not a matter for public consultation.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
79.	Resident 126	3.23 Contamination	Concerns regarding how remediation will be funded. Proposes the SPD detail the full remediation process including placing onus on developers to provide indemnity for costs of residents.	The costs of any remediation will be borne by the developers. Remediation strategies submitted by the developers would detail how excavations, remediation and disposal are to be carried out as well as mitigation to protect public health. These would be made available to view on the Council's planning portal as is standard procedure. Indemnity clauses are beyond the remit of the SPD.
80.	Resident 129	3.23 Contamination	Requests details of the Council's own in house contamination consultants	The Council has Environmental Health Officers with experience of land contamination matters. More specialist external support would be used if required.
81.	Resident 46 Resident 165 Resident 199 Resident 200 Resident 233	3.23 Contamination	<p>Requests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive contamination survey by independent body - SEPA Standard Radiation Testing ensuring all areas of potential radioactive contamination are identified and characterised - Detailed Remediation Plan: to be approved by Council - Independent verification that the remediation process is being carried out as agreed with results published 	<p>The Council is aware of the previous uses of the wider site, including the airfield and the potential for land contamination associated with these uses.</p> <p>Both current applications for the site include initial land contamination assessments. During the course of the planning application process to date, the Council's Environmental Health team have commented on both applications and recommended that, if planning permission is granted, planning conditions be imposed which would require further investigation and assessment of potential land contamination matters, including potential radioactive contamination, so as to ensure the land is suitable for the proposed uses.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<p>This further investigation and assessment must be carried out in accordance with the Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) Framework and underpinning good practice guidance.</p> <p>Where the findings from the further investigation and assessment identifies unacceptable risks to human health and/or the environment, a detailed Remediation Scheme would be required, and this would need to be approved by the Council.</p> <p>The Council is liaising with other agencies including the Environment Agency and the radiation team at the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) who are also engaging directly with concerned parties.</p>
82.	Resident 55 Resident 206 Resident 217 Resident 218 Resident 222	3.23 Contamination	<p>Requests full contamination survey includes findings of any:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PAHs - PFOS and PFOA - Radium 226 - Asbestos - Lead and arsenic <p>Requests publication of SEPA standard radiation test</p> <p>Requests detailed remediation and containment plan with costings</p> <p>Requests independent contamination assessment and mitigation be a pre-</p>	Response as above at Ref 81.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>commencement condition on planning permission</p> <p>Reassurance to residents and the public that their health will not be negatively affected.</p> <p>Lack of requirement in SPD to consult with Public Health England</p>	
83.	Tollerton Parish Council Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council Cllr Richard Butler Cllr Jonathan Wheeler Cllr Debbie Mason Resident 4 Resident 8 Resident 15 Resident 28 Resident 31 Resident 33 Resident 34 Resident 37 Resident 39 Resident 41 Resident 43 Resident 44	3.23 Contamination	<p>Concern over remediation process.</p> <p>Some claims of WWII aircraft being buried on site</p>	Response as above at Ref 81.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 47 Resident 49 Resident 50 Resident 51 Resident 52 Resident 53 Resident 55 Resident 57 Resident 58 Resident 65 Resident 67 Resident 70 Resident 71 Resident 72 Resident 73 Resident 74 Resident 76 Resident 78 Resident 79 Resident 83 Resident 87 Resident 89 Resident 98 Resident 101 Resident 105 Resident 110 Resident 115 Resident 116 Resident 117 Resident 118 Resident 120			

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 121 Resident 125 Resident 126 Resident 127 Resident 128 Resident 129 Resident 130 Resident 132 Resident 133 Resident 137 Resident 139 Resident 142 Resident 143 Resident 147 Resident 148 Resident 149 Resident 150 Resident 152 Resident 153 Resident 155 Resident 160 Resident 165 Resident 167 Resident 168 Resident 172 Resident 175 Resident 179 Resident 181 Resident 182 Resident 183 Resident 184			

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 185 Resident 186 Resident 192 Resident 193 Resident 195 Resident 198 Resident 199 Resident 202 Resident 209 Resident 216 Resident 219 Resident 220 Resident 221 Resident 223 Resident 224 Resident 230 Resident 231 Resident 233 Resident 234 Resident 238 Resident 239 Resident 240 Resident 241 Resident 242 Resident 243 Resident 244 Resident 245 Resident 248 Resident 249 Resident 251 Resident 253			

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 254 Resident 255 Resident 257 Resident 258 Resident 262 Resident 264 Resident 265 Resident 266 Resident 267 Resident 268 Resident 271 Resident 272 Resident 273 Resident 274 Resident 277 Resident 279 Resident 283 Resident 284 Resident 285 Resident 286 Resident 289 Resident 290			
84.	Resident 24 Resident 27 Resident 87	3.23 Contamination	Concerns the remediation process will not be carried out safely and be detrimental to residents' health	Response as above at Ref 81.
85.	Resident 121	3.30 Highways Network	Suggests highways network map is inaccurate as it does not highlight listed streets in Tollerton village used as rat runs.	Streets listed in the representation are not on the map.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
86.	Resident 130	3.33 Walking and Cycling	Requests bridleways BW6, BW9 and BW21 are described in the list alongside other walking and cycling routes on page 33. Requests NCN 15 is highlighted in the key and on the map	The route of NCN 15 does not cross this map.
87.	Resident 33 Resident 34 Resident 156 Resident 163 Resident 193 Resident 238 Resident 247 Resident 256	3.33 Walking and Cycling	Suggests the site is described inaccurately as well connected by walking and cycling routes and that significant upgrades to crossing facilities over the A52 are necessary.	The site assessment does not describe the site as well connected. Safe crossing facilities are outlined as necessary for delivery of the site that should occur early in development. How these safe crossings can be delivered will be subject to detailed planning applications.
88.	Resident 50 Resident 276	3.33 Walking and Cycling	Suggests there are inaccuracies where the site has been described as connected to recommended walking and cycling routes as there is currently no appropriate route through the site and connections across the A52 are unsafe. Requests grade separated active travel route across the A52 to ensure safety and maintain traffic flow.	The site assessment does not describe the site as well connected. Safe crossing facilities are outlined as necessary for delivery of the site that should occur early in development. How these safe crossings can be delivered will be subject to detailed planning applications. It is accepted that the potential option of a foot and cycle bridge needs to be explicitly referenced in the SPD – see Modification below at ref 282.
89.	Active Travel England	Site content – walking and cycling	Would question whether this loose connection of footpaths and bridleways are a network of walking and cycling active travel routes that people would find coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and	This section of SPD attempts to reflect the reality of current circumstances. Reference to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan can be usefully added.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>attractive (LTN 1/20 core principles) to access the high order facilities west of the A52 as described.</p> <p>This section needs to also include reference to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) work.</p>	<p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Add after paragraph 3.34 the following paragraph:</p> <p><u>'Nottinghamshire County Council, with partner local authorities, published the D2N2 Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan in April 2021, with the publication more recently of updates to its delivery programme. The Plan is a long-term approach to developing comprehensive local cycling and walking networks. It identifies potential improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure for investment in the short, medium and long term, up to 15 years. It will be of relevance in informing the Active Travel infrastructure that needs to support development.'</u></p>
90.	Resident 148 Resident 226	3.35 Public Transport	Requests figures are amended to reflect recent bus service changes	<p>The existing public transport routes shown on Figure 14 are subject to reasonably regular change and therefore what is shown is only a snapshot in time.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Update Figure 14 with amended map of existing bus routes.</p>
91.	Cllr Steve Calvert	3.40 Facilities	Questions whether the leisure facilities identified in the site appraisal are close enough to be local.	The appraisal identifies Rushcliffe Arena as the nearest facility rather than being local.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
92.	Historic England	3.43 Heritage	<p>Historic England welcomes the provisions for heritage, including archaeology, set out in the draft SPD. In particular, we welcome the consideration given to the listed pill boxes and airfield layout within the design approach of document. We note the heritage related information in the design code section of the draft SPD too.</p> <p>In addition, we welcome the requirement for a site-wide Stewardship Strategy to avoid an ad-hoc piecemeal approach. We note that this includes provisions for heritage assets through S106 planning obligations (page 36).</p> <p>You will be aware of our published advice on historic military aviation sites https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-military-aviation-sites/ which may be of use to prospective developers in due course.</p>	The Council notes support for the SPD
93.	Resident 14 Resident 21 Resident 52 Resident 54 Resident 71 Resident 72 Resident 73 Resident 87	3.43 Heritage	Concerns the development will not contribute to preservation or enhancement of listed assets and the setting of the airfield and contradicts local plan policies	The heritage section of the document outlines how inclusion of new public open space will enhance the pillboxes through improved accessibility and landscaping. It also outlines a two stage process for the protection of heritage significance: a heritage strategy to be applied at outline planning application stage and

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 107 Resident 121 Resident 125 Resident 126 Resident 132 Resident 133 Resident 142 Resident 150 Resident 179 Resident 190 Resident 193 Resident 198 Resident 199 Resident 205 Resident 245 Resident 262 Resident 265 Resident 268 Resident 271			surveys etc to be carried out through the reserved matters stage.
94.	Resident 52 Resident 54 Resident 121 Resident 126 Resident 132 Resident 142 Resident 224 Resident 245 Resident 268	3.43 Heritage	Suggests the proposed development contravenes the Protection of Military Remains Act	This act pertains only to remains which have been designated by the government which the former RAF Tollerton is not.
95.	Resident 110 Resident 121	3.43 Heritage Strategy	Suggests the SPD does not meet legal or procedural requirements with regards to	This is not accepted. The SPD outlines how heritage assets on the site will be protected

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 125		heritage assets, the environment and consultation.	and enhanced. In the case of the pillboxes and runways this involves their landscaped inclusion into local open space. It is also outlined how landscaping at the site's boundary and attenuation features will be the focus of biodiversity improvements required for new development. The document has been subject to a public consultation procedure, as has the allocation of the land for housing. Those proposals affecting a heritage asset and/or its setting would be assessed against heritage related development plan policies.
96.	Resident 132 Resident 177 Resident 193 Resident 224 Resident 226 Resident 245 Resident 267	3.43 Heritage Strategy	Concerns that pillboxes will be lost through development as only 4 are identified to be conserved.	There is an identified requirement to retain, maintain and preserve the seventeen pillboxes, and the location and alignment of the runways within the development. The list of on-site infrastructure to be delivered as part of the SPD includes the securing of all the pill boxes. The restoration of at least two of each kind of pillbox on the site is also required (noting that one of one type has already been restored at Spire Hospital) and the rest of the pillboxes stabilised to ensure they do not deteriorate.
97.	Resident 31	3.43 Heritage Strategy	Expresses concern there is no risk assessment detailed to understand the impacts from increases in traffic from construction and new residents to heritage assets.	The SPD document establishes the need for a mitigation strategy to lay out how assets will be protected and enhanced and that this will be informed by a full Built Heritage Statement(s) detailing all the assets in the vicinity of the development and their sensitivities. It is accepted that the document does not explicitly

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				refer to the impacts from construction and other traffic although this will be a consideration at planning application stage
98.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Heritage	<p><u>Heritage & Archaeology</u></p> <p>Ideally, a comprehensive archaeological evaluation across the full site should be undertaken at this stage to inform the overall masterplan. However, if this is not feasible, the SPD should at least make clear that a completed evaluation will be required for each parcel at application stage. The plan shown in Figure 16 of the Draft SPD currently focuses on designated heritage assets (primarily buildings) and does not include the available archaeological data. This figure should be updated to include information from the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record to better illustrate the known archaeological features within and around the site. The SPD should recognise the Grantham Canal as a non-designated heritage asset. The approach to built heritage contained within sections 3.43-3.50 is generally supported.</p>	<p>Support welcomed for paragraphs 3.43-3.50. It is considered that identification and consideration of archaeology and designated and non-designated heritage assets are matters for the planning application stage.</p> <p>The SPD does recognise the Grantham Canal as a non-designated heritage asset (see, for example, Figure 16 of the SPD).</p>
99.	Resident 219	Heritage	The SPD has many inconsistencies / errors throughout. Take pillboxes for example, the document refers to 18 pillboxes on the page 11 map, whilst 17 retained pillboxes are referred to in the	As recognised in the SPD, there are 18 pillboxes in the vicinity of the site, the locations of which are visible on Figure 4. As stated within the Heritage section with Chapter 3, these are all to be retained. One of these 17

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			Heritage section on page 36 and 16 pillboxes are shown within the red line of the map on page 37. A heritage trail connecting the retained pillboxes is mentioned but does not appear on maps showing pedestrian rights of way. How many pillboxes will be retained, will they be protected?	Pillboxes has already been restored at Spire Hospital, and this is not included on the map within the heritage section. As outlined in the SPD all the pillboxes will be kept within public open space and close to active travel infrastructure.
100.	Resident 49	3.52 Ecology	Concern Grantham Canal and its associated wildlife site are not mentioned in the ecology section.	These are mentioned both in this section and others.
101.	Cllr Steve Calvert	3.54 Noise and Air	Section on noise and air needs to be updated to reflect airport's closure	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Update paragraph 3.54, plus paragraphs 2.7 (transport infrastructure), 3.68 and 4.6 to reflect the change in circumstances in respect of use of the airfield and the implications of this.</p>
102.	Resident 156	3.54 Noise and Air	Concern raised about frequent helicopter flights over the site, sometimes occurring every 2-3 minutes, and the associated noise impact on the area.	While it is not strictly within the SPD's scope to control current helicopter activity, the SPD reflects the closure of the airport and therefore anticipates that helicopter activity will cease prior to development. Any residual aviation use will need to be relocated. Noise impacts from former airfield operations will not persist once the site is redeveloped, and mitigation measures such as landscaped buffers will further protect residential amenity.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
103.	Resident 1 Resident 7 Resident 142	Air quality	Concerns over air quality and requests for traffic and AQMA monitoring	AQMAs are implemented in areas where national and international air quality objectives are not being met. Air quality is monitored constantly from local air quality monitoring stations. The borough no longer has any AQMAs, however, one would be implemented if routine monitoring identified air quality below said objectives.
104.	Resident 126	3.6 Existing Features	Requests clarity on which businesses will be allowed to remain open. Queries the nature of employment uses on the site and whether further measures will be taken to ensure residential amenity is protected.	<p>It is acknowledged that some business operating on the site were dependent on the airport to remain open. Existing businesses in the industrial units on the site will be allowed to continue operating.</p> <p>The SPD demonstrates that a landscaped buffer will be established adjacent to the A52 and this will help to mitigate traffic noise. The new employment uses are located in such a way that goods vehicles would access it from the A52 and not through any residential area. Applications for employment development will be assessed individually on the impact of any business within them and light pollution.</p>
105.	Resident 148	3.61 Green Infrastructure	Queries reference to policy 32 of the local plan with regards to Grantham Canal	Policy 32 addresses the need for new and enhanced open space within the borough. New open spaces abutting the canal are proposed as part of the development
106.	East Midlands Pipeline	3.64 Green Infrastructure	Request increased easement be allowed for the pipeline to allow for operational safety if development comes forward.	SPD establishes that an easement in line with the legislative requirements will need to be provided. The requested provisions for Section

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>Requests that a Section 106 Agreement makes provision for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EMP to recover costs incurred if the developer does not meet the required easement - Obligations on developers to provide required safety infrastructure - Requirement for developers to maintain access for pipeline inspection and maintenance - Requirement for developers to carry out and fund any risk assessments 	106 Agreements are noted and these would need to be considered further as part of relevant planning applications.
107.	Resident 49	3.64 Green Infrastructure	Asks that easement either side of the pipeline be respected.	The SPD refers to requirement to provide a 3 metres easement either side of the pipeline. Easement will be left either side of the pipeline in line with legal requirements.
108.	Sport England	4.25 Secondary School	<p>Sport England would welcome the opportunity to discuss more detailed layouts for the formal provision of outdoor sports facilities for the secondary school. A mechanism for the inclusion of a Community Use Agreement (CUA) for the sporting facilities provided would be encouraged. Our Design Guidance Notes contain more detailed guidance on the design of outdoor and indoor facilities and other issues such as sports lighting. Sport England will also welcome discussion for</p>	The Council notes the offer of support in respect of design of sports facilities.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			outdoor and indoor leisure provision at pre-application stage for the primary schools.	
109.	Resident 90 Resident 162 Resident 194	4.28 Primary Schools	Concern construction of two new primary schools may leave existing Tollerton Primary unviable.	The requirement for two new primary schools has been identified by the Local Education Authority, taking into account projected pupil demand and capacity in existing local schools.
110.	Resident 49	4.40 Community Hall	Requests that community centre and facilities are delivered as development comes forward to allow social cohesion from the outset	The expectation is that neighbourhood centres and associated community facilities will be provided in the middle phase of development when demand for these has been consolidated. However, specific requirements will be a matter for the IDP and/or as part of the planning application process.
111.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Education	<u>Education</u> Early delivery of secondary school and first primary school is critical. The SPD should require on-street parking and pick up/drop off facilities near schools. Sites must be serviced and accessible for walking/cycling. SPD should include triggers and collaboration mechanisms for school delivery.	Overall timings for the provision of primary and secondary school places, together with triggers, will be a matter for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and section 106 legal agreements. The comments of the Local Education Authority are therefore noted with regard to ongoing discussions on the delivery of the new schools. The detail of off and on-street parking around schools will be a matter for detailed planning applications to which the highways authority is a statutory consultee. The need to update section 5.7 of the site wide design code is noted.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>The reference to the number of school places at section 5.7 of the site wide design code should, also include the number of sixth form places, as below.</p> <p>"The development is likely to require the provision of c.640 secondary places and 120 sixth form places using the 16/100dw and 3/100dw yield adopted by NCC"</p>	<p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Change first sentence of section 5.7 of the site wide design code to</p> <p>'The development is likely to require the provision of a circa 640 secondary places <u>and</u> <u>120 sixth form places</u> using the 16/100dw <u>pupils to dwellings yield</u> and <u>3/100 pupils to dwellings yields</u> adopted by Nottinghamshire County Council.'</p>
112.	Resident 126	Education	Queries the catchment of the proposed schools	School catchments are defined by the County Council as the local education authority or schools themselves.
113.	Resident 194	Education	Requests consideration of timing and scale of primary school provision within the development; suggests two two-form entry schools may be needed but warns against early delivery due to potential destabilisation of existing schools; recommends initial single-form entry until demand is demonstrated and existing capacity is fully utilised.	At what points in the development of the site the schools should be delivered will be informed by advice from the County Council as local education authority. These matters will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and planning applications.
114.	Resident 224 Resident 262 Resident 277 Resident 282	Education	Suggests the provision of schools on site is inappropriate as there will not be enough children to necessitate them and there is no funding available from the DfE or The County Council For them	The development and opening of schools on site will be informed by further engagement with the County Council as local education authority.
115.	Resident 277	Education	Requests that the SPD establish school sites, if not delivered, will not be	There is no reason to assume that the schools will not be delivered. If one was the school

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			repurposed for further commercial development and instead relandscaped or turned into public space	sites were not to be delivered, it would be preferable to consider alternative uses for the land at the time, rather than to address this through the SPD.
116.	Resident 168 Resident 230 Resident 231 Resident 244 Resident 248 Resident 253 Resident 257	Gypsy and traveller accommodation	Queries the need for both the homes and gypsy and traveller provision in the allocation	Need for such development is established by the adopted Rushcliffe Local Plan and the emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan, and outlined in supporting evidence including the Borough's Housing Needs Assessment and Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment.
117.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.13 Residential	Requests clarification as to what "proportionate" contributions may be.	<p>The proportionality of each development's contribution towards strategic infrastructure (those infrastructure items that will support delivery of the whole site) would be based on the proportional need for infrastructure to support that development, relative to the infrastructure needs of development across the site as a whole.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.13 is not as clear as it could be in this respect and would benefit from rewording. Plus, a corresponding change to paragraph 4.24 relating to development on existing employment site is also appropriate.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Replace paragraph 4.13 with the following text: 'In all cases where new housing is delivered</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<p><u>within the allocated site, including on equine paddocks and/or through the redevelopment of existing residential properties, these developments would be expected to make proportionate contributions towards the whole of the allocated site's strategic infrastructure requirements (roads, drainage, education, libraries, green and blue infrastructure, biodiversity net gain, etc.). This would be necessary in order to facilitate the individual site being brought forward as part of the wider development.</u></p> <p>Replace the final sentence of paragraph 4.24 with the following text:</p> <p><u>'Any redevelopment or changes of use of this "existing employment" would also be expected to contribute on a proportionate basis towards the appropriate strategic infrastructure (i.e., not education) to facilitate the delivery of the wider site.'</u></p>
118.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.7 Residential	Suggests it would be better to state the number of homes likely to be delivered by the development would emphasize the affordable housing requirement.	Given the exact number of homes to be built on the site is not fully determined, prescribing the number of affordable homes to be delivered is not possible or appropriate. Moreover, the Local Plan policy for the site expresses the requirement for the site as a percentage, rather than as a specific target.
119.	Resident 161	Housing	Concern expressed about who will occupy affordable housing, specifically	The SPD sets out requirements for affordable housing in line with the Rushcliffe Local Plan

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			questioning whether migrants will be housed.	policy and national planning policy. It does not determine who will live in these homes. Allocation of affordable housing is managed through the Council's housing policies and statutory frameworks, which ensure homes are provided based on need and eligibility criteria, not nationality or ethnicity.
120.	Resident 22 Resident 67 Resident 173 Resident 246 Resident 265	Housing	Concerns policy targets and mechanisms are not enough to secure housing affordable to younger and lower paid workers. Concerns that the SPD lacks enforceable targets and mechanisms to ensure housing remains affordable. Suggests there is no transparent viability testing or commitment to ensure affordable housing is delivered concurrently with market homes.	The Council uses all available mechanisms to secure affordable housing and has set a target for up to 30% of homes on this development to be affordable. Section 106 agreements typically contain clauses to ensure affordable homes remain affordable in perpetuity (for the long term). Viability testing for the site and affordability requirement was conducted for the 2014 Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in establishing current policy requirements. Further viability assessment would only be required if any developer were to claim that development as agreed has become unviable. As the SPD sets out, this will be assessed by the Council and if it results in any changes to obligations under section 106 etc, there will be a requirement for the developer to produce further FVAs at agreed stages of the development.
121.	Resident 226	Housing	Queries where bungalows will be built on the site.	This is a detailed matter to be dealt with at the planning application stage. It is anticipated that bungalows would be located throughout the

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				site, particularly in areas close to local amenities and bus stops.
122.	Resident 226	Housing	Questions the location of 4 storey buildings	The SPD and its site wide design code indicates that taller residential properties would be expected to be located in key locations – e.g. neighbourhood centres and adjacent, primary streets and prominent plots.
123.	Resident 271	Housing	Suggests there is no clear commitment to affordable housing.	The SPD states that the expectation is for 30% of the development to be delivered as affordable homes
124.	Vistry Homes Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land	Housing	Notes that the required proportion of M4(3) wheelchair accessible dwellings reflects evidence yet to be tested at examination and requests the SPD is not prescriptive about the figure	<p>This requirement in the SPD does not, as it should, accord with the requirements of Local Plan Part 2 policy 12 and therefore needs amending to reflect current policy requirements.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Replace paragraph 4.12 with the following text:</p> <p><u>'In accordance with Local Plan Part 2 Policy 12, there is a requirement for 1% of dwellings on schemes of 100 dwellings or more to be M4[3][A] [wheelchair adaptable] compliant. On a scheme of 4,000 dwellings this equates to 40 dwellings.'</u></p>
125.	Resident 41	Housing mix	Suggests that the Council use its own developer to build more affordable homes on the scheme	As with most local councils in the UK, RBC is not a housebuilder. The existing policy requires 30% of the development to be affordable housing

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
126.	Cllr Richard Butler	4.14 Neighbourhood Centres and Community Hub	Requests clearer trigger point for delivery of health facilities	Noted, however, a delivery trigger has not yet been established. This would be as part of the IDP (which will be finalised post SPD adoption) and delivery requirements would be included in Section 106 agreements.
127.	Resident 116 Resident 148	4.14 Neighbourhood Centres and Community Hub	Concern over capacity of local supermarket and whether a new one will be provided in the neighbourhood centres.	The SPD establishes that retail uses in the neighbourhood centres can include small supermarkets.
128.	Resident 139	4.14 Neighbourhood Centres and Community Hub	Concern amenities in local towns and suburbs may be under strain if residents rely on them	The SPD establishes the need to deliver infrastructure such as new schools, neighbourhood centres and healthcare as soon as the development is progressed sufficiently to support these. This should help mitigate impact on surrounding communities' facilities
129.	Resident 148	4.14 Neighbourhood Centres and Community Hub	Requests Gamston local centre is enhanced to address increase in usage from new residents	The SPD establishes that contributions to off-site infrastructure will be secured as part of the development where necessary and justified. This could include enhancements to Gamston local centre's amenities.
130.	Resident 32	4.14 Neighbourhood Centres and Community Hub	Expresses concern that any businesses delivered may not be beneficial to the community such as the car dealership delivered at Edwalton	The neighbourhood centre would be expected to provide for a smaller scale retail provision than seen at the business park in Edwalton. The SPD suggests a small supermarket, shops, hairdressers, takeaways and a pub may be permitted.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
131.	Resident 38 Resident 124 Resident 163 Resident 194	4.14 Neighbourhood Centres and Community Hub	Suggests the SPD misses an opportunity to create a new community with a heart. Expresses support for spaces for the community to develop and spend leisure time.	The SPD establishes a requirement for up to two neighbourhood centres encompassing retail units, and community uses alongside key public space.
132.	St Luke's Church Gamston	4.14 Neighbourhood Centres and Community Hub	Requests prioritisation of a multi-functional community space to provide toddler groups, community cafes etc. Highlights lapse of such provision within Edwalton development.	The SPD establishes that community facilities will be provided in conjunction with the neighbourhood centre.
133.	Resident 226	Neighbourhood areas	Queries what appropriate scale is regarding the neighbourhood centres.	The SPD identifies that it is expected that the neighbourhood centres provide a small supermarket unit, as well as general retail, hot food businesses and healthcare.
134.	Resident 158	4.17 Education	Requests clarification on several points: 1. Whether there is scope to expand the proposed 4FE secondary school; 2. Whether schools will be built in line with pupil growth; 3. What impact new schools will have on existing local schools;	The SPD establishes required provision for two new primary schools and one 4 form entry (FE) secondary school in line with guidance from the Local Education Authority, taking into account projected pupil demand and capacity in existing local schools. Delivery of education facilities will be phased to coincide with pupil demand and occupation levels, ensuring the needed capacity is available.
135.	Normanton on the Wolds Parish Council Resident 40 Resident 133 Resident 161	4.19 Gypsy and Traveller Pitches	Objects to the provision of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation within the allocation	The Greater Nottingham and Ashfield District Council Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2021) establishes the need for further accommodation.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 168 Resident 179 Resident 219 Resident 186 Resident 238			
136.	Resident 1 Resident 76 Resident 117 Resident 160 Resident 162 Resident 166 Resident 170 Resident 174 Resident 181 Resident 243	4.2 Access and Movement	Requests access only be made to the site via Lings Bar Road and not Tollerton Lane, Cotgrave Lane or Cotgrave Road particularly for construction traffic. Also requests no construction or residents' access be made to the site before construction of a new roundabout off Lings Bar Road and full construction logistics plan has been submitted.	While there are proposals for favoured access arrangements within the SPD, more detailed road access will be dealt with at the application stage. The relevant planning consents will require a construction method statement which will need to set out appropriate traffic management measures for construction traffic.
137.	Resident 173 Resident 188 Resident 272	4.20 Specialist Housing	Concern that wheelchair-friendly homes and bungalows alone will not meet the needs of senior citizens. Requests specific accommodation for older people and inclusion of support services such as GP surgeries as an essential part of the development.	The SPD identifies the need for a mix of housing types and tenures to meet the needs of all age groups, including older people and those with mobility needs. This is in accordance with development plan policies. The standards in respect of wheelchair adaptable dwellings are Local Plan policy. The SPD also identifies land for community facilities, including health and provision, and requires early engagement with the NHS and other stakeholders to ensure delivery of GP surgeries and support services alongside housing. More detailed requirements will be confirmed within the IDP and then at the

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				planning application stage in consultation with relevant providers.
138.	Resident 133 Resident 179	4.21 Employment	Concerned new employment development will not be delivered and that there is lack of detail over what this will be.	A substantial portion of the site is allocated for employment uses which include manufacturing, light industry, warehousing, office space and other uses. There is an identified need and demand for such development locally and as such it is anticipated these will be delivered.
139.	Rapleys LLP	Employment land	Requests employment designation reflects flexibility of Class E uses and permit development of food stores for example.	The Local Plan sets the employment land requirements for the site. Introducing an alternative approach is not a matter for the SPD.
140.	Resident 112 Resident 179	Employment land	Objects to the positioning of employment uses.	The employment provision on the site is located directly adjacent to the A52 to ensure minimal disruption to residential portions of the development from any goods traffic and provide the best access to the road network.
141.	Resident 235	Employment land	Concerned new employment uses will negatively impact amenity of existing residents west of the A52. Queries how new noise and light pollution will be mitigated and how National Highways Environmental Sustainability Strategy will be implemented.	It is not anticipated that the proposed employment portion of the development would significantly impact the residential amenity of those living west of the A52 as a landscaped barrier already exists between the road and this neighbourhood. The likelihood is further strengthening of the landscaping west of the A52 will occur as part of its upgrading to a dual carriageway although National Highways oversee implementing their own strategies.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
142.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.25 Secondary School	Queries the meaning of 4FE+ with reference to the secondary school.	<p>4FE means that each year group will have four classes or forms in it and the plus relates to the fact that it will include a sixth form.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Text is added to paragraph 4.25 to help explain what 4FE+ means.</p>
143.	Resident 112	4.25 Secondary School	Supports location of secondary school away from Tollerton village	Noted
144.	Resident 141	4.25 Secondary School	Expresses support for a secondary school on the site	Noted
145.	Resident 17 Resident 164	4.3 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Concern that development beyond the ring road will result in a less defensible Green Belt boundary	The site is on land already removed from the Green Belt. The SPD establishes a requirement for landscaping and biodiversity features around the edge of the site to create defensible Green Belt Borders
146.	Resident 50 Resident 126	4.31 Blue Green Infrastructure	Concerned that the SPD does not cover how required biodiversity net gain targets will be met. Cites consultation response from Paul Philips (RBC Ecologist) on a planning application for the site.	The SPD establishes several new areas of biodiversity to be delivered including enhancements to the Grantham Canal corridor, new copse and hedgerow planting particularly in the south of the site and water meadows adjacent to Polser Brook. The SPD also establishes that new water attenuation features and public greenspace to be delivered in the development present opportunity for BNG delivery. It would not be appropriate or

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				reasonable to identify in fine detail how BNG requirements will be met.
147.	Resident 71 Resident 72 Resident 73	4.31 Blue Green Infrastructure	Concern SPD does not assess ecological impact from development	Ecological surveys are a requirement of planning applications. Development plan policy requires that development that would significantly affect a priority habitat or species should avoid, mitigate or as a last resort compensate any loss or effects.
148.	Canal and River Trust Normanton on the Wolds Parish Council	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Requests strengthened green buffer requirements to protect the canal's rural character, particularly east of Tollerton Lane	The SPD makes proposals for retained planting and new landscaped areas including attenuation basins next to the canal. These matters will be subject of more detailed design and landscaping considerations as part of the planning application process.
149.	Forestry Commission	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Requests provision is made for maintenance and stewardship of trees on site	The appropriate management of new urban trees will be included in stewardship arrangements for roads and open spaces on the site, as be a requirement of planning permissions.
150.	Forestry Commission	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Suggest the provision of street trees and copse planting throughout the development to extend woodland habitat into the urban area	Street trees are proposed within the design code particularly along primary streets and there is scope for the inclusion of copse planting within local green spaces to be provided in the development.
151.	Forestry Commission	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Support the provision of woodland edge habitat as part of the development	The Council welcomes support for the SPD

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
152.	Natural England	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	<p>Suggests reference be made to Natural England's: Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles and Standards, particularly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S1: Green Infrastructure Strategy Standard • S2: Accessible Greenspace Standard • S3: Urban Nature Recovery Standard • S4: Urban Greening Factor Standard • S5: Urban Tree Canopy Cover Standard <p>In addition the Natural England's Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide provides practical guidance alongside other national design codes, and may be of help as the detailed plans for the Gamston/Tollerton site develop further.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Include reference to both the Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles and Standards and Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide after paragraph 4.32.</p>
153.	Resident 107	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Suggests the proposed green space is redundant as the site already offers access to nature and "Authentic rural landscapes".	The site is currently composed of the former airport and agricultural fields which are not publicly accessible or particularly biodiverse. The development of open space will be more accessible with active travel infrastructure built to a high standard. There will also be biodiversity interventions as part of these open spaces.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
154.	Resident 112	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Supports the principle of a woodland buffer but concerned over the width and depth may not be a sufficient barrier. Requests the buffer be mature woodland and not rely on copse and hedgerow which will not shield the view of development. Also concerned that some of this may be attenuation basins.	The dimensions of the woodland landscaping to the south of the allocation are not yet defined but will be informed by assessment of the existing character and a requirement to provide biodiversity uplift, (a variety of planting will likely be required to achieve this). Some attenuation within the woodland buffer may be appropriate.
155.	Resident 113	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Request improvement to maps to make leisure routes clearer. Supports provision of equestrian access and asks that upgrades to crossings include making them appropriate for horses.	Further maps specifying the leisure routes proposed will be produced as part of detailed planning applications. It is not expected that Pegasus crossings over the A52 will be necessary.
156.	Resident 116	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Requests that tree planting on the southern boundary of the site should precede development	Tree planting on the site will likely be determined by triggers to landscaping schemes and BNG delivery. Consideration must be taken as to whether effective habitat development would be impeded by construction happening on adjacent land at the same time.
157.	Resident 133	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Questions where the proposed allotments will be in the development and raises concern that growing produce may be dangerous because of contamination.	There are several broad areas identified within the SPD whether allotments are expected. As stated in the SPD the land will be tested to establish where there is existing contamination and remediated where necessary.
158.	Resident 141	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Expresses support for green edge	Noted

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
159.	Resident 157 Resident 183	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Concern that the development will result in the loss of most green spaces in Tollerton, citing previous examples of green areas in Rushcliffe being built over.	The SPD places strong emphasis on the provision and protection of green and blue infrastructure. It sets out requirements for substantial areas of public open space, green corridors, and biodiversity enhancements across the site. These measures are designed to maintain ecological value and provide accessible recreational spaces for new and existing communities. The SPD also includes design principles to ensure landscaping and green buffers are integral to the development, mitigating loss of green character with Tollerton.
160.	Resident 83 Resident 86 Resident 89 Resident 128 Resident 142 Resident 147 Resident 149 Resident 151 Resident 152 Resident 207 Resident 239 Resident 242 Resident 246 Resident 290	4.31 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Concern that the green buffer does not appear as agreed in 2014 and may fall outside the red line boundary. Request clear map	The Local Plan and Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan do not establish exact locations or dimensions for green buffers, but the SPD establishes that those within the site include hedgerow, tree and copse planting along the southern boundary of the site. The expectation is that green buffers will be delivered on site (within the red line boundary) as it will contribute to the biodiversity features. The design of the green buffer will be informed in part by ecological surveys for the planning applications and therefore it is currently not possible to map its exact extent.
161.	Resident 159	4.31 Green Infrastructure	Requests clearer explanation of how estate landscaping will minimise the	The SPD establishes a strong requirement for green infrastructure and edge treatments to

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			visual and environmental impact of the new development on existing housing areas.	protect the character of surrounding areas. This includes landscaped buffers, new woodland planting along the southern boundary, and enhancements to the Grantham Canal corridor. These measures will provide visual screening, biodiversity improvements, and a softer transition between the development and existing housing. Detailed landscaping design will be agreed at planning application stage to ensure effective mitigation and compliance with development plan and SPD objectives.
162.	Resident 191 Resident 200	4.31 Green Infrastructure	There is a need for a green buffer around Tollerton Park and consultation with residents upon its form	In accordance with Local Plan policy requirements, applications abutting Tollerton Park will be required to demonstrate how they protect residential amenity.
163.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.32 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Requests further explanation as to what blue infrastructure is, suggests reference to page 62. Explain more clearly The Edge Treatments.	<p>It is accepted that it would be helpful to clarify that blue infrastructure relates to water-based infrastructure. It is felt that that The Edge Treatments is adequately explained when reading the document as a whole.</p> <p><u>Modifications</u></p> <p>Change paragraph 4.32 (first bullet) to refer to '...proposed <u>water-based</u> infrastructure...'. </p>
164.	Cllr Steve Calvert Resident 226	4.33 Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy	Requests key refers to the areas on Figure 24 marked A, B and C and what they are. Request edge treatments are more clearly defined.	A, B, and C are the cross sections of the edge treatments displayed on figures 25, 26 and 27. This could be made clearer.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<p><u>Modification</u> In the title above figures 25, 26 and 27, add reference to the fact that the cross sections are shown on the preceding figure 24.</p>
165.	Resident 226	Figure 31 Green Corridor Strategy	Object to indicative green corridor map showing these running through properties on Tollerton Lane	<p>The graphic on Figure 33 is slightly crosshatched when it goes across the existing properties on Tollerton in recognition of this fact. It is appropriate to make clear that nothing related to the development will happen on land inside and outside of the site without the full consent of the landowner.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Include after paragraph 4.33 a new paragraph which states that nothing related to the development will happen on land inside or outside the boundary of the development site without the full consent of the landowner.</p>
166.	Active Travel England	Green and Blue Infrastructure	Distinguish leisure routes from everyday active travel routes; ensure lighting, surfacing, safety measures.	<p>It is felt that leisure routes are appropriately distinguished from everyday active travel routes, albeit they may serve a dual purpose in certain cases. So that recreation routes may better serve this dual purpose it is suggested that additional wording is included at 4.31 in respect of the provision of suitable surfacing and potential lighting where appropriate.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				At paragraph 4.31, fourth bullet point change text to: "A wide range of recreation facilities, including a network of footpaths and cycle tracks <u>with suitable surfacing and lighting (where appropriate)</u> , sports provision, play areas and trim trails.'
167.	Resident 272	Green and Blue Infrastructure	Requests that 'wetland tree species' be planted on the eastern edge of the site to improve environmental impact	Wetland habitat does not preclude some tree planting on the eastern boundary. Different habitats are proposed on the eastern and southern boundaries to improve the range of wildlife that the site can support.
168.	Tollerton Parish Council	Green and Blue Infrastructure	Request early involvement of the Parish Council in design and delivery of green spaces.	The design of green spaces will be consulted on where appropriate in accordance with normal practice.
169.	Resident 148	4.34 Sports Provision	Concern over lack of detail regarding indoor sports facility e.g. where, who and what provision. Suggests this risks being forgotten.	The SPD establishes a requirement for three areas of sports provision within the development including some sports pavilions, which will require proportionate contribution from all developers. The SPD does also suggest that some off-site indoor sports demand will be generated and outlines contributions to off-site infrastructure for these. Further details are not available for inclusion within the SPD but will be established within the site IDP and as part of planning permissions.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
170.	Plumtree Cricket Club Resident 178 Resident 288	4.34 Sports Provision	<p>Expresses interest in the outcome of the proposed sports hub development, specifically regarding the inclusion of cricket pitches and associated facilities. Request for Plumtree Cricket Club to adopt any new cricket facilities</p>	<p>The SPD identifies land for a sports hub as part of the green infrastructure strategy to provide formal recreation facilities for the new community. While the SPD does not comprehensively specify individual sports at this stage, the design will be informed by local needs and Sport England guidance. The inclusion of cricket pitches and associated facilities will be considered during detailed design and delivery, in consultation with relevant stakeholders and local sports organisations. Plumtree Cricket Club's request is noted.</p>
171.	Sport England	4.34 Sports Provision	<p>Concern that no further information has been provided in relation to the provision of <u>indoor sports facilities</u>. Sport England has previously provided detailed outputs from our Sports Facilities Calculator (SFC) on the demand generated from the increase in population that would be generated from the development. The draft SPD only refers to provision of a sports hall at the proposed secondary school. The draft SPD should contain more detail on the exact provision of on site and the provision off site for indoor sports facilities, referring back to the outputs of the SFC. This can be used to evidence that the proposed development makes the adequate provision Sport England have requested.</p>	<p>The SPD establishes that contributions to off-site facilities such as swimming pools may be sought through the planning process. Further details are not yet available for inclusion within the SPD but will be established within the site's IDP and as part of the planning application process.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
172.	Sport England	4.34 Sports Provision	<p>Provision of <u>outdoor sports facilities</u> is welcomed, however, concern remains over the types of pitches being provided and overall numbers. I would again refer to Sport England's previous responses to the outline application and suggest the SPD take greater account of the outputs of the Playing Pitch Calculator as provided as part of the planning application response. Again, this can then be used to show how the proposed development makes the adequate provision for outdoor sport, Sport England have requested.</p>	<p>The SPD sets out that sports provision will be informed by the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy. This contains estimates of the need for various pitches that will be generated by the development. Further details are not yet available for inclusion within the SPD but will be established within the site's IDP and as part of the planning application process.</p>
173.	Sport England	4.34 Sports Provision	<p>Sport England would wish to see on site and off site costs for both indoor and outdoor community sport provision (playing pitches, sports halls, swimming pools) included in the Gamston SUE IDP.</p>	<p>This is noted and is the intention for the IDP</p>
174.	Cllr Steve Calvert	Sports and Play	<p>Requests clarification as to whether new pocket parks are the same as the LAEPs identified in the play strategy and requests consistent reference as LAEP not LEAP.</p>	<p>Some of the LAEP's may be located in pocket parks but these are distinct design features. References to LAEPs needs correcting and will be picked up as a mirror amendment.</p>
175.	Sport England	Sports Provision	<p>The start of this section (page 60) states that requirements for play and sports facilities will be informed by the Council's</p>	<p>Agreed, that the reference to sports facilities in connection should be removed.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>Play Strategy. The next section (page 61) goes into more detail on “sports provision”, stating an approach informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy and associated calculator and Sports Facilities Calculator.</p> <p>Sport England would request that clarification is given here as these two approaches would contradict each other. Suggest “Sports” is removed from page 60?</p>	<p><u>Modification</u> Within chapter 4, change the ‘Sports & Play’ title to ‘Play’ only.</p>
176.	Sport England	4.40 Sports Provision	<p>It is unclear from the description whether the community hall that is proposed is intended as a multi-use hall capable of accommodating indoor sport. If it is included under the sports provision section so it is assumed this will include sporting provision? If so more detail required. If it is not intended for the community hall to include indoor sport then this should be removed.</p>	<p>It is yet to be determined whether the community hall that is proposed is intended as a multi-use hall capable of accommodating indoor sport. This will be established within the site’s IDP and as part of the planning application process. Given which, the title preceding paragraph 4.34 needs changing to also refer to community hall provision.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Change title preceding paragraph 4.43 to: ‘Sports and <u>Community Hall</u> provision’</p>
177.	Sport England	4.41 Sports Provision	<p>We would welcome inclusion under this section of detail on active design measures to encourage access to the central sports hub from non vehicle modes. For example, inclusion of details on cycle parking, cycle and walking</p>	<p>The SPD identifies how the central sports hub will be connected via various active travel routes through the site. The more specific details for which will be established as part of the planning application process.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>routes etc. Further detail on active design and Sport England's active design guidance can be found on our website at: https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design?section=whats-new-section</p>	
178.	Resident 148	Allotments	Suggests there are no areas identified for allotments in the plan.	Several indicative locations are identified for allotments as part of the SPD and the appended Site Wide Design Coding Plan
179.	Resident 158	Allotments	Queries how existing Tollerton allotments will be affected.	Tollerton Allotments are outside the site boundary and will not be subject to development.
180.	Resident 160	Allotments	Question raised about whether the soil quality in the proposed allotment space will be suitable for cultivation.	Land for allotments is identified as part of the green infrastructure strategy but does not specify soil quality at this stage. Detailed design and delivery will be addressed during the planning application process, including site investigations to ensure the land is appropriate for allotment use. Where necessary, soil improvement measures will be implemented to provide suitable growing conditions. The developers, and potentially also the local authorities, will work with relevant stakeholders to ensure allotments meet community needs.
181.	Resident 219	Allotments	Tollerton Allotments not shown on the map (page 35), what will happen to these?	Tollerton Allotments are outside the site boundary and will not be subject to development

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
182.	Canal and River Trust	4.48 Drainage Strategy	<p>Request canal is referenced within drainage strategy and that safeguards to prevent flow of uncontrolled runoff into the canal.</p> <p>It is suggested that it would be appropriate for the SPD to indicate that the potential for discharging surface water to the canal could be investigated as a sustainable drainage option.</p>	<p>Attenuation basins are planned between the canal and much of the residential development and therefore runoff into the canal should be limited</p> <p>The suggestion that canal might be able a drainage option is noted and it would be appropriate for this to be highlighted within the SPD.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Add to paragraph 4.50 the following text:</p> <p><u>'The potential for discharging controlled surface water to the canal could be investigated as a sustainable drainage option.'</u></p>
183.	Cllr Richard Butler Resident 33 Resident 43 Resident 70 Resident 71 Resident 72 Resident 73 Resident 101 Resident 107 Resident 110 Resident 125 Resident 126 Resident 148	4.48 Drainage Strategy	<p>Concern that the site assessment does not consider existing flooding events in the neighbouring villages or mitigate for this.</p>	<p>The SPD states the requirement for SuDS to manage drainage at greenfield rates with permeable surfaces being the default across the site. The document also states the intention for runoff to be directed to attenuation features particularly on the northern edge of the site (therefore away from Tollerton). In accordance with national and local planning policy requirements, flood risk assessments will be required for relevant planning applications to assess the individual and cumulative impacts of development.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 160 Resident 171 Resident 176 Resident 202 Resident 216 Resident 222 Resident 242 Resident 245 Resident 260			<p>It is accepted that there is merit in referencing that areas to the south of the site are already susceptible to flooding and development of the site should not worsen this situation.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>After paragraph 4.53 add the following new paragraph:</p> <p><u>'Site drainage should not increase the likelihood of flooding in areas off site, including those areas already susceptible to flooding. This includes, for instance, areas to the south in the vicinity of Cotgrave Lane and Tollerton Lane, Tollerton.'</u></p>
184.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Questions whether there is any proposed development within flood zone 3	The current indicative plans propose this be part of the green infrastructure or sports provision on site.
185.	Environment Agency	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Suggests it should be made clear that the indicative attenuation basins are outside Flood Zone 3 and ideally Flood Zone 2	<p>Clarification in this respect could be usefully included in the SPD.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Include within paragraph 4.48 the following text: '<u>Environment Agency advice is that attenuation basins should be located outside the design flood (1 in 100 year event plus an allowance for climate change) and ideally outside flood zone 2.</u>'</p>
186.	Environment Agency	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Suggests more prescriptive guidance as to where and how 'Natural Flood	There would be merit in additional mention within the SPD of Natural Flood Management.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			Management' could be implemented especially in the east of the site and offers support in identifying this.	<p>The Council notes the offer of support in developing Natural Flood Management measures for the east of the site.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Add the following text to paragraph 4.53: '...relevant guidance shall be used) <u>and also the principles of Natural Flood Management as advocated by the Environment Agency.'</u></p>
187.	Resident 1 Resident 7 Resident 15 Resident 43 Resident 50 Resident 126 Resident 136 Resident 142 Resident 239	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Require SuDS to manage run-off at greenfield rates; secure foul drainage capacity SPD-level drainage strategy showing exceedance routing away from Tollerton.	The SPD states the requirement for SuDS to manage drainage at greenfield rates with permeable surfaces being the default across the site. The document also states the intention for runoff to be directed primarily to attenuation features on the northern edge of the site (away from Tollerton village). Details of new sewerage infrastructure is required to be agreed with Severn Trent.
188.	Resident 113	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Concerned construction of attenuation ponds on the northern boundary may limit opportunities to screen the development from Bassingfield. Concerned the treatment of the canal front will negatively impact Bassingfield.	Implementation of attenuation basins is not incompatible with native tree and hedge planting and there will be such enhancements to the canal corridor as established by the SPD. The character of the new housing is proposed to enhance the canal corridor which should strengthen the visual separation between the village and the new development.
189.	Resident 113 Resident 126 Resident 130	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Concerned whether the two culverts under the Grantham canal to the north are sufficient for increased run off	Rather than runoff being directed to culverts the primary method of drainage will be through

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				permeable surfaces, soakaways and attenuation features.
190.	Resident 120	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Concerned the development relies solely on attenuation ponds for flood mitigation.	The SPD establishes that permeable surfaces will be the default across the development. Also rain gardens, waterbutts, rain chains and other collection features will be required across all built aspects of the development. Attenuation basins will also form part of the flood mitigation measures in line with the Environment Agency's guidance.
191.	Resident 126	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Requests investigation into sewerage capacity at the site.	Severn Trent are aware of the site's allocation for around 4000 dwellings and have not expressed concern over capacity in the network. It will also be consulted on individual applications for the site as they come in.
192.	Resident 130	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Concerns the County Council and Environment agency have no records of flooding in the area. Requests full flood risk assessment and provision of future flooding risk analysis by the Environment Agency.	The referenced map on page 31 is an Environment Agency flood risk map. Flood risk assessments will be expected alongside applications for the site in line with NPPF guidance and the Environment Agency will be consulted on the anticipated effect of development for its future flood risk data.
193.	Resident 133	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Concerned Severn Trent are not aware that their advice regarding drainage is required	As a statutory consultee, Severn Trent is aware of the development and of its responsibility to provide advice and support on a drainage strategy. Engagement with them is ongoing.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
194.	Resident 139	4.48 Drainage Strategy	The SPD does not demonstrate compliance with NPPF Section 14 particularly paragraphs 159–169, which require a sequential and exception test approach.	Any sequential and exception test would be a requirement for the site's allocation and/or planning applications.
195.	Resident 143 Resident 150 Resident 152 Resident 162 Resident 171 Resident 179 Resident 188 Resident 206 Resident 218 Resident 223 Resident 243 Resident 253 Resident 268 Resident 284 Resident 285	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Concern that the hydrology section does not acknowledge regular flooding near Tollerton, particularly at the junction with Cotgrave Lane, where several houses have experienced repeated flooding.	The SPD recognises the need to manage flood risk and sets out guidance concerning the drainage strategy for the site. The requirement will be for SuDS to maintain greenfield runoff rates, permeable surfaces as the default, and attenuation basins positioned away from Tollerton. In accordance with national and local planning policy requirements, a full site flood risk assessment will be required as part of each application to assess the individual and cumulative impacts of development. The expectation would be that existing conditions in locations off-site are not worsened by development.
196.	Resident 148	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Proposes more SuDS should be provided within the proposed areas of housing to reduce the speed of runoff to the periphery. Also questions how management and maintenance of SuDS will be funded	While attenuation basins are not proposed within the residential areas of the development, SuDS will be present in the form of swales and soakaways where these may be incorporated into street scenes to slow the rate of runoff. Several funding options for stewardship of these are proposed within the SPD including service charges, rents from business units and hire charges for community and sports facilities.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
197.	Resident 50 Resident 65 Resident 87 Resident 121 Resident 171 Resident 220 Resident 224 Resident 233 Resident 243 Resident 245 Resident 248	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Suggests existing flooding round the site has been ignored and there is no flood risk assessment. Concern the SPD does not comply with local and national flood risk policy.	<p>Environment Agency data demonstrates that parts of the site and significant areas around it face existing flood risk, being in flood zones 2 and 3. This has been considered during production of the SPD and will continue to inform a full drainage strategy. Local and national policy is to direct development away from areas of existing or future flood risk, where possible reducing flood risk in the area.</p> <p>In accordance with national and local planning policy requirements, flood risk assessments will be required for relevant planning applications to assess the individual and cumulative impacts of development. The expectation would be that existing conditions in locations off-site are not worsened by development.</p> <p>The drainage strategy in the SPD establishes how permeable surfaces, soakaways, attenuation basins and biodiversity improvements will manage runoff directing drainage away from Tollerton which is an area of existing flood risk.</p>
198.	Resident 75	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Concern that flood water will naturally flow towards Bassingfield as it is between the site and the river. Suggests there is insufficient detail regarding the scale of upgrades required to sewers.	Most of the attenuation features planned are along the northern edge of the site and these will retain and drain runoff from the development. Improved landscaping and biodiversity particularly adjacent to the Grantham Canal and Polser Brook should help

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<p>to increase soil permeability. The SPD states the requirement for SuDS to manage drainage at greenfield rates with permeable surfaces being the default across the site. The management of drainage will be expected not to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>The development is predicted to have a high impact on sewerage infrastructure given its scale and detailed modelling is planned to indicate whether capacity improvements are required. Severn Trent, however, indicates that there are no “showstoppers” in accommodating development. Severn Trent indicate the SPDs approach to surface water will ensure a low impact on the surface water sewerage infrastructure.</p>
199.	Tollerton Parish Council Cllr Debbie Mason Resident 26 Resident 40 Resident 47 Resident 57 Resident 58 Resident 67 Resident 76 Resident 79 Resident 83 Resident 88	4.48 Drainage Strategy	Concerns over flooding on Tollerton Lane and Cotgrave Lane and how this will be managed through development	<p>The SPD states the requirement for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage drainage at greenfield rates with permeable surfaces being the default across the site. The document also states the intention for runoff to be directed to attenuation features particularly on the northern edge of the site (therefore away from Tollerton). In accordance with national and local planning policy requirements, flood risk assessments will be required for relevant planning applications to assess the individual and cumulative impacts of development.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 89 Resident 90 Resident 98 Resident 105 Resident 116 Resident 117 Resident 118 Resident 126 Resident 127 Resident 128 Resident 129 Resident 133 Resident 138 Resident 142 Resident 147 Resident 167 Resident 171 Resident 175 Resident 176 Resident 179 Resident 183 Resident 185 Resident 191 Resident 230 Resident 231 Resident 234 Resident 239 Resident 241 Resident 244 Resident 249 Resident 250			<p>It is accepted that there is merit in referencing that areas to the south of the site are already susceptible to flooding and development of the site should not worsen this situation.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>After paragraph 4.53 add the following new paragraph:</p> <p><u>'Site drainage should not increase the likelihood of flooding in areas off site, including those areas already susceptible to flooding. This includes, for instance, areas to the south in the vicinity of Cotgrave Lane and Tollerton Lane, Tollerton.'</u></p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 252 Resident 254 Resident 257 Resident 262 Resident 265 Resident 266 Resident 271 Resident 272 Resident 273 Resident 279 Resident 281 Resident 282 Resident 283 Resident 286 Resident 287 Resident 289 Resident 290			
200.	Severn Trent Water	Drainage	<p>Anticipate low impact from new surface water to the sewerage network as the drainage strategy does not propose this is disposed of into the sewer system.</p> <p>Expresses support for the drainage strategy. To support this, it would be desirable to see a requirement to ensure that any drainage strategy evidences how it has followed the drainage hierarchy.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the drainage strategy. It would appropriate to add reference to government's national standards for sustainable drainage systems and the drainage hierarchy within it.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> <u>Add the following text to paragraph 4.53:</u> <u>'...relevant guidance shall be used) and also the principles of Natural Flood Management as advocated by the Environment Agency. It should be demonstrated how the drainage strategy follows the drainage hierarchy as set out in government's national standards for</u></p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<u>sustainable drainage systems (updated 30 July 2025 or subsequent updated version).'</u>
201.	Resident 43	Drainage Strategy	Request for improvement to flow along Polser Brook to help alleviate flood water	Development would be expected not to exacerbate existing off-site issues. Improvement to the flow of Polser Brook would only be appropriate to mitigate development impacts. There is currently no reason to add text to the SPD to require this to happen.
202.	Resident 44	Drainage Strategy	Requests full assessment of Thurlbeck Dyke and Polser Brook to establish risk both from flood water but also risk of pollution resulting from development	The local hydrological importance of the two watercourses is highlighted by the SPD. There is a requirement for them to be considered when developing a full drainage strategy; this will likely include keeping them clear of obstructions. The eastern edge of the site abutting Polser brook will also be subject to implementation of new water meadows to improve capacity for drainage of surface water.
203.	Resident 46 Resident 57 Resident 87 Resident 95	Drainage Strategy	Requests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A sitewide Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) prior to development - Integration of findings from section 19 Flood Investigation Report and Storm Henk into the FRA and mitigation strategy - Preservation of existing natural soakaways to maintain their flood management function - Inclusion of a climate resilience plan detailing measures to mitigate 	The site was allocated by the 2014 Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and this was supported by the Greater Nottingham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Each application on site will require a full FRA. Section 19 reports are produced to document causes of and responses to flooding events by risk management authorities such as the County Council. The identified actions are to be carried out by those same authorities not the developers and therefore cannot necessarily be integrated into the Mitigation strategy.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			flood risk associated with climate change	As part of a drainage strategy, some existing soakaways will be enhanced and new ones created to deal with runoff. The SPD embeds numerous interventions to enhance climate resilience within the development.
204.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Drainage, green infrastructure & Flood Risk	<p><u>Drainage, green infrastructure & Flood Risk</u></p> <p>The SPD must address surface water flooding, especially Tollerton Lane (historic flood events). Future Flood Risk Assessments should include proven outfalls, climate change allowances, and SuDS with long-term maintenance plans. Highway drainage must have positive outfalls; permeable paving is not reliable long-term.</p>	Any planning applications can only address any issues arising from their particular development, and cannot reasonably provide for mitigation against the existing surface water issues. Other matters are for consideration at the planning application stage.
205.	Cllr Jonathan Wheeler	Flooding	Concerned over increases in flooding on the A52 and requests further assurance that residents in Bassingfield will not be negatively affected by this.	Most of the attenuation features planned are along the northern edge of the site and these will retain and drain runoff from the development. Improved landscaping and biodiversity particularly adjacent to the Grantham Canal and Polser Brook should help to increase soil permeability. The SPD states the requirement for SuDS to manage drainage at greenfield rates with permeable surfaces being the default across the site. The

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				management of drainage will be expected not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
206.	Resident 274	Flooding	Concerned document does not show predicted flood zones accounting for new development	The Environment Agency publishes flood maps projecting future risk accounting for new development. These are available on its website.
207.	Severn Trent Water	Sewerage network	Anticipate a high impact on the sewerage network due to the flow generated by the development, capacity of the existing sewer and proximity to outflows. State that this would benefit from more information regarding connection points and approach to surface water management.	The Council will ensure continued communication with the water company as to the proposals for sewerage connections. Such detail is more appropriately dealt with at the planning application stage.,
208.	Canal and River Trust	4.5 Design Objectives	Request canal be integrated into the health and wellbeing objectives e.g. fitness trail linked to towpath	There are planned links from the canal to a new fitness trail outlined.
209.	Active Travel England	Design Objectives	Suggest a new movement objective is needed, for instance: • To create a new settlement where active and sustainable travel are a natural choice for local journeys and offer a genuine choice of modes for journeys beyond the site boundary.	Agreed, the addition of such wording is a sensible suggestion. <u>Modification</u> Include at paragraph 4.5 the following new bullet point: <u>'To create a new community where active and sustainable travel are a natural choice for local journeys and offer a genuine choice of modes for journeys beyond the site boundary.'</u>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
210.	Vistry Homes Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land Resident 133	4.53 Drainage Strategy	Make reference to more recently published Environment Agency climate change allowance guidance.	<u>Modification</u> The guidance was originally published in 2026 and has been subject to more recent updates. Update paragraph 4.53 to reflect this position.
211.	Resident 133	4.55 Biodiversity Net Gain	Concerned the Council does not have the expertise to monitor BNG delivery	Biodiversity net gain is a legal and/or policy requirement of development. BNG agreements mean that developers/landowners are liable for the stewardship of their BNG units for a statutory 30-year period while the habitat matures, with scope for enforcement action to be taken for non-compliance. The Council has its own ecologists to assist this process.
212.	Resident 187 Resident 191 Resident 202 Resident 241	4.55 Biodiversity Net Gain	Inadequate buffer zone to mitigate against loss of existing biodiversity and wildlife	Planning applications submitted after the adoption of the relevant act will be assessed on whether they provide an acceptable Biodiversity Gain Plan. In respect of those submitted before the act are subject to a Local Plan policy requirement to achieve biodiversity net gain.
213.	Resident 200 Resident 257	4.55 Biodiversity Net Gain	Concern over loss of biodiversity during the site's development	Biodiversity Net Gain is a statutory requirement and applications for the site submitted since the act passed will be required to demonstrate an acceptable BNG strategy.
214.	Resident 26 Resident 160 Resident 191 Resident 192 Resident 199	4.55 Biodiversity Net Gain	Concern for how wildlife along the Grantham Canal will be affected	A buffer will be retained along the canal encompassing wildflower meadow and wetland habitat. This will protect and enhance the biodiversity present. The 2018 Rushcliffe Local

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 241 Resident 270			Plan Part 2 includes a policy requirement for net gain in biodiversity to be achieved.
215.	Resident 31 Resident 116 Resident 249	4.55 Biodiversity Net Gain	Objects to any BNG delivery off site	While national policy permits biodiversity net gain to be delivered off site where delivery onsite is unrealistic, the SPD establishes that the delivery should be primarily on site through the extensive new wildlife features such as attenuation basins and woodland. The design objectives state that BNG is to be delivered off site within the borough as a last resort.
216.	Resident 33 Resident 230	4.55 Biodiversity Net Gain	Sites report by Wild Justice which found significant proportions of BNG had not been delivered relating to sites in Keyworth and Ruddington.	Biodiversity net gain is a legal requirement introduced by the UK Government. BNG agreements mean that developers/landowners are liable for the stewardship of their BNG units for a statutory 30-year period while the habitat matures, with scope for enforcement action to be taken for non-compliance. . The SPD highlights the requirement for delivery of BNG on site, and only elsewhere in the borough as a last resort.
217.	Resident 34 Resident 37 Resident 41 Resident 47 Resident 53 Resident 59 Resident 70 Resident 78 Resident 80 Resident 82	4.55 Biodiversity Net Gain	Suggests the outlined biodiversity interventions will not accommodate for the wildlife displaced or meet the net gain required. Concern that the presence of protected species means development impacting upon their habitat would be illegal.	The biodiversity gain interventions outlined in the SPD will be delivered in line with the government's published BNG metrics. While development of the site will result in habitat loss, there are a range of habitats proposed including enhancements to those already present on site such as copse and hedgerow. BNG agreements mean that developers/landowners are liable for the stewardship of their BNG units for a statutory

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 84 Resident 87 Resident 107 Resident 110 Resident 111 Resident 116 Resident 121 Resident 125 Resident 126 Resident 132 Resident 137 Resident 139 Resident 142 Resident 150 Resident 153 Resident 160 Resident 183 Resident 187 Resident 192 Resident 199 Resident 222 Resident 224 Resident 226 Resident 230 Resident 231 Resident 233 Resident 235 Resident 238 Resident 239 Resident 241 Resident 243			<p>30-year period while the habitat matures, with scope for enforcement action to be taken for non-compliance.</p> <p>The protected species list has legal status. Surveys will be required to inform any areas of the site where these species are present, how they can be protected from development and how their habitats could be protected, enhanced or compensated for elsewhere.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 244 Resident 245 Resident 249 Resident 253 Resident 258 Resident 260 Resident 262 Resident 263 Resident 267 Resident 272 Resident 277 Resident 284 Resident 285 Resident 287			
218.	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity	Concern there is no timeline presented for updating ecological surveys and assessments given the long buildout period. Request reference to up-to-date ecological surveys and early creation of habitats in phasing.	Ecological surveys and the delivery and phasing of habitat improvements and creation will be a matter for the planning application process.
219.	Resident 250	Biodiversity	Concerned the number of new children within the development may pose a threat to any areas designated for wildlife.	The development has areas of public park, sports provision, play area and private garden sufficient for the number of children who may live there.
220.	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity Net Gain	Concern BNG strategy is insufficient to determine whether full provision will be possible on site. Request sitewide BNG assessment to determine this.	National guidance is that phased sites should submit a sitewide BNG assessment to effectively deliver the required gain across all phases. However, the reality is that separate planning applications are coming forward on

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				the site and this needs to be dealt with accordingly.
221.	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity Net Gain	Concerned BNG requirement does not align with the county wide ambition for 20% set out in the LNRS. Request Government mitigation hierarchy is referenced (NPPF para 168a)	There is not a local plan policy requirement for 20% BNG. This is a draft proposal for Rushcliffe within emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan, but it this is still subject to potential change.
222.	Vistry Homes Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land	Biodiversity Net Gain	Requests it is stated that the mandatory 10% BNG is not relevant to applications submitted before its adoption.	It is understood by developers and the Council that applications submitted before adoption of the act will not be required to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain. This is a matter of law and does not need mentioning in the SPD.
223.	Cllr Richard Butler Resident 132 Resident 157 Resident 161 Resident 171	4.56 Movement Framework	Concerns over increase in traffic from the development to the A46 through Cotgrave	The SPD sets out the need to review options and then implement measures to manage traffic in a way that minimises or avoids traffic movements to the south through Tollerton village and beyond, including to the A46.
224.	National Highways	4.56 Movement Framework	Requests clear expectations are outlined for travel plans and confirmation that active travel arrangements will be delivered early in development – before occupation.	The SPD sets out the requirement for a Framework Travel Plan and Framework Travel Plan Co-ordinator (for residential and employment development). That document will specify in more detail the expectations for travel plans. While the exact trigger points for the delivery of active travel measures will be determined within the IDP and/or as part of the planning

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				application process, the SPD identifies the expectation that key active travel measures will be the subject of early delivery.
225.	Resident 200 Resident 201 Resident 202 Resident 220	4.56 Movement Framework	Road/cycle/footpath proposals vague and contradictory. Not enough detail on how access will be achieved and timescales.	<p>The SPD establishes the requirement for several new or enhanced junctions with the A52, the delivery of which will be tied to the findings of the ongoing transport assessment. The SPD is also clear that segregated cycle lanes will be delivered in conjunction with all the primary streets on site and secondary streets will have a shared foot and cycleway.</p> <p>While the exact trigger points for the delivery of active travel measures will be determined within the IDP and/or as part of planning permissions, the SPD identifies the expectation that key active travel measures will be delivered the subject of early delivery.</p>
226.	Resident 226	4.56 Movement Framework	Queries whether Tollerton Lane will be widened and where the extra width will come from	The SPD identifies that majority of Tollerton Lane, as it runs through the site, will not form a primary route for vehicle traffic. Any widening of the existing carriageway would be achieved only on land forming part of the existing public highway and/or land under the control of developers.
227.	Resident 75	4.56 Movement Framework	Concerned Bassingfield lacks infrastructure to cope with increase in pedestrian and road traffic.	It is proposed mention is included at paragraph 3.65 to better ensure that the impact of additional traffic through the village of Tollerton and Bassingfield will be carefully considered and suitable mitigation measures adopted and

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				implemented to ensure that traffic levels are maintained to an acceptable minimum level. See the modification below at ref 236.
228.	Resident 75	4.56 Movement Framework	Requests a full Transport Assessment and Construction Logistics Plan be developed through transport modelling. Requests national highways assess the A52 capacity to assimilate the additional traffic. Question justification for park and ride proposal.	Planning applications on site will need to be supported by transport assessments to assess the individual and cumulative impacts of development on the allocation. National Highways have been involved since before the site was allocated in 2014 and the development proposed is part of ongoing transport modelling. The park and ride proposal would be independent of the development and is proposed to relieve traffic on the A52 and in the urban area. It may be required to help mitigate the impacts of development. The relevant planning consents will require a construction method statement which will need to set out appropriate traffic management measures for construction traffic.
229.	Resident 156 Resident 185 Resident 188	Highways	Concern that traffic speeds on the A52 currently exceed the limit, raising safety risks for access and movement associated with the development.	The need for safe and efficient access arrangements and active travel routes crossing the A52 is acknowledged. Detailed junction design and traffic management measures will be addressed at the planning application stage in consultation with National Highways and the Local Highway Authority.
230.	Resident 38	Highways	Suggests road connection under the A52 to Gamston or at the Ambleside junction of the A52.	The SPD establishes the need for several road connections to the A52 Gamston Lings Bar but these are expected to be at grade including one at the Ambleside junction of the A52. It is

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			Proposes a link to the A52 north of the site may mitigate congestion on the section south of the city.	not anticipated that a connection to the north of the site will be necessary. Detailed access arrangements will be established as part of the planning application process.
231.	Cllr Jonathan Wheeler	Transport	Requests highways comments from relevant authorities are addressed before adoption and suggests the location of amenities on site is difficult to evaluate without full access arrangements	<p>This would require delaying the SPD's adoption until the completion of all transport assessment work. It is, however, considered more beneficial to have the SPD in place as a matter of priority; with more details in respect of transport and other outstanding matters then being established in the IDP and as part of planning application approvals (including within their associated section 106 legal agreements).</p> <p>This is, firstly, to avoid missing the likely 30 June 2026 cut off for SPDs to be adopted. Beyond that date, a development framework for the site would have to be prepared as Supplementary Plan (SP); which would require a public examination of the draft SP. The whole process would add months to the preparation process, thereby further delaying the site's vital contribution to the Borough's housing land supply. Secondly, avoiding further delays is also important to minimise the very real risk that current planning applications are appealed on the basis of non-determination prior to the SPD being adopted. If applications were taken to appeal without any form of adopted SPD, this would fundamentally prejudice ensuring</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				that individual development parcels are delivered in a coordinated and complimentary manner.
232.	Cllr Steve Calvert	Transport	Requests further public consultation on the strategic highways proposals.	All strategic highway proposals requiring planning permission would be subject to public consultation as is standard. Any updates to existing planning applications in this respect would be consulted on.
233.	National Highways	Transport	It is recommended that the SPD provides an updated housing trajectory and phasing plan, clearly linked to the timing and delivery of the required transport infrastructure. This should include confirmation that phases should only come forward once highways mitigation is identified, approved and secured through planning obligations or conditions	The interplay between housing delivery and the provision of transport mitigation measures cannot be fully established at this stage, ahead of the completion of transport assessment work and then identification of transport mitigation requirements. Appropriate triggers for mitigation requirements will be established within the IDP and as part of the planning application process, including within section 106 agreements.
234.	National Highways	Transport	Request timeline for completion of VISSIM modelling update and adoption of the SPD and approval of planning applications should not proceed until modelling is complete as this creates uncertainty over access strategy	A timetable for VISSIM model is a technical matter and unnecessary for inclusion in the SPD. The reasons for not delaying the SPD's completion until after transport assessment work is completed are set out above at Ref 231.
235.	National Highways	Transport	Request SPD sets out clear mechanisms for securing and phasing highway improvements e.g. - Funding arrangements	These details cannot be fully established at this stage, ahead of the completion of transport work. The SPD provides the necessary framework to allow transport mitigation

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost sharing - Trigger points 	<p>requirements to be subsequently established within the IDP and as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>The reasons for not delaying the SPD's completion until after transport assessment work is completed are set out above – see Ref 231.</p>
236.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport	<p><u>Transport & Connectivity</u></p> <p>There should be a comprehensive transport assessment encompassing the whole site prior to the consideration of planning applications. In addition, there should be requirement in the SPD for a vision-led strategy, as stated in the NPPF. The SPD should prioritize pedestrian and cycle links (including a bridge over the A52), and integration with Gamston Park & Ride which is currently downplayed in the SPD. A wider diagram should be presented to show the alignment of proposed improved routes to be delivered as part of the development. The Draft SPD pushes these matters back to be considered at individual planning stages, when they need to be determined strategically and associated and integrated with the principle of the site layout.</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a high-level framework to enable the delivery of a site with a number of landowners. The SPD sets out that more detailed mitigation matters, together with their delivery are matters for the proposed Infrastructure Delivery Plan and planning applications and their associated S106 agreements.</p> <p>The SPD provides the necessary framework to allow highway access arrangements and transport mitigation requirements to be subsequently established within the IDP and as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>The reasons for not delaying the SPD's completion until after transport assessment work is completed are set out above at Ref 231.</p> <p>In light of the comments by the County Council, Active Travel England and others about the potential active travel bridge across</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>Access arrangements to the A52 are currently unclear from the SPD.</p> <p>There will be a requirement for bus services from the outset. Mobility hubs need clearer planning.</p> <p>Bassingfield and Tollerton villages require early mitigation measures to avoid increased “rat running”</p> <p>There appears to be reliance on the potential for developer contributions to fund infrastructure as opposed to benefit in kind. The NCC view as highway authority is that works are best installed as an in-kind contribution by the developing parties which ensures they are delivered at an appropriate time and linked to development phases.</p> <p>Access arrangements and off-site highway impacts have not been truly identified or addressed for viability purposes which has a significant bearing on completing an SPD. A contribution should be sought towards the provision of a park and ride site in the Gamston area. Where any application parcel abuts Tollerton Lane, a 5m depth of land abutting Tollerton Lane will be safeguarded by the Highway Authority to enable future highway works to facilitate</p>	<p>the A52 from the site to Gamston, it is considered appropriate to include reference to the potential option of a bridge across the A52 for pedestrian and cyclist and make clear that this option should be that this should be assessed alongside an at-grade crossing option. See the Modification below at ref 282</p> <p>It is not accepted that the SPD downplays the potential role that a Gamston Park and Ride might serve in helping to mitigate the impacts of traffic generation associated with the site. The SPD sets out the need for transport assessment work for the proposed development to consider the need for and feasibility of a Park and Ride site and, ultimately support its delivery, if one is needed to support development. Notwithstanding this, additional text could usefully be included in the SPD to refer to previous work undertaken in respect of a Gamston park and ride site and the need to examine this.</p> <p>The comments that highway related works are best installed as an in-kind contribution by the developing parties are noted. If light of which it is considered appropriate to make changes to the Delivery Strategy chapter (chapter 5) to better support this position.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>safe access for the public within the wider SUE. In addition primary and secondary routes through the site should have a minimum carriageway width of 6.2-6.5 metres.</p> <p>Triggers for infrastructure delivery, including for transport, must be defined in SPD, and not left to individual applications.</p>	<p>In respect of the comment that Bassingfield and Tollerton villages require early mitigation measures to avoid increased “rat running”, appropriate changes can be made to paragraphs 3.65 and 4.72 to support this.</p> <p><u>Modifications</u></p> <p>At paragraph 3.65 change the text as follows:</p> <p>‘The impact of additional traffic through the village of Tollerton <u>and Bassingfield</u> will be carefully considered and suitable mitigation measures adopted and implemented to ensure that traffic levels are maintained to an acceptable minimum level, such as (but not limited to) additional traffic calming, <u>bus priority</u> or the possible stepping up of limiting Tollerton Lane <u>to bus priority only</u> and re-directing traffic through the new development. The detail of the final measures will be subject to discussions with the Highway Authorities and implemented through the planning applications.’</p> <p>At start of paragraph 4.72 change the text as follows:</p> <p>‘Measures will be applied on Tollerton Lane and within the village of Tollerton to reduce the level of vehicular traffic travelling through Tollerton village and vice versa, and further deter rat running. <u>There is possible option of limiting Tollerton Lane (between the site and Tollerton village) to bus priority only.</u> However,</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<p><u>should access to private vehicles be maintained, The the...</u></p> <p>At the Delivery Strategy (chapter 5) include within 'B Off-site infrastructure', bullet point 9 add the following text after the first sentence: '<u>Previous work has been undertaken in relation to a Park and Ride site which should be examined and brought up to date in liaison with the highways authorities.</u>'</p> <p>Make various changes to Delivery Strategy (chapter 5) to emphasise that it is the County Council's expectation that highway works will be delivered as Works in Kind where possible.</p>
237.	Pedals	Transport	Suggests active travel proposals around schools and the neighbourhood centre are inadequate	The indicative locations of the schools and neighbourhood centres are linked into the indicative strategic active travel routes within the site. More detailed arrangements will be established as part of planning permissions
238.	Resident 168	Transport	Queries what will be done to mitigate light noise and air pollution from the A52 to properties in Gamston during and after development of new gateways.	<p>The relevant planning consents will require a construction method statement which will need to set out appropriate mitigation measures for construction.</p> <p>It is Local Plan policy that, in respect of new developments, noise attenuation is achieved and light pollution is minimised. This policy will be applied in deciding planning applications for</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				development and attaching conditions to planning permissions.
239.	Resident 249	Transport	Request action to close Tollerton Lane to through traffic from private vehicles happens before opening of primary access from the A52	Mitigations for traffic along Tollerton Lane as with all traffic mitigations will be informed by the transport assessment currently being undertaken. More detailed arrangements will be established as part of planning permissions.
240.	Resident 276	Transport	Concern the development will prompt inappropriate use of Ambleside and Beckside for access.	The planning applications for the site will be required to demonstrate that the impacts of development are not unacceptable on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation measures, would not be severe.
241.	Resident 43	Transport	Requests commitment to consult with residents over traffic mitigation measures	Major mitigation proposals would typically form part of planning applications and be subject to public consultation. More measures, typically more minor ones, might be required as a condition of planning permission and would not normally be subject to public consultation.
242.	Resident 75	Transport	Considers Bassingfield has not received proportionate mitigation measures and requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closure of the pedestrian access over the canal and potentially the footpath to the village - Closure of the road through the village providing direct access to the A52 Westbound 	There are no plans to close the right of way over the canal or to Bassingfield; this would not be reasonable. Mitigation measures protecting the character of Bassingfield include enhancements to the Grantham Canal including attenuation features and distinct frontage to the homes at the edge of the Gamston Fields Character area. The SPD does not suggest locating formal sports or allotment facilities in the vicinity of the village.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased buffer between the village and new properties - Extension of Gamston Meadows character area west - The location of formal sports and allotment provision away from Bassingfield Village 	
243.	Resident 77	Transport	Requests the development commit to funding a fourth bridge over the Trent	A fourth road bridge over the Trent is not identified as necessary for the development to come forward.
244.	Resident 82 Resident 106 Resident 238	Transport	Requests construction of tram connection to Nottingham alongside commitments to bus improvements and enhanced road capacity.	The provision of a tram to support delivery of the site is not a requirement of the local plan and there are currently no firm proposals or identified funding for such a connection. Bus improvements will be provided by local operators, with supporting funding from the development where necessary. The design code contains a requirement for bus stops to be conveniently located adjacent to key destinations along the Primary Street, and to be within a 400 metre catchment from most homes..
245.	Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council	Transport – park and ride	Requests reference to connections to a new park and ride site are deleted as the plan is aspirational with no formal proposals made to deliver this.	The 2014 Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy identifies that bus priority measures and other improvements related to bus services, which may include a park and ride site, are necessary for delivery of the site. The County Council, as local highways authority, has reiterated its desire for a park and ride to support delivery of the site. Accordingly,

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				reference with the SPD to a park and ride site to possibly support delivery is considered appropriate.
246.	Vistry Homes Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land	Transport – park and ride	Objects to the off-site infrastructure list referencing a park and ride facility	The 2014 Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy identifies that bus priority measures and other improvements related to bus services, which may include a park and ride site, are necessary for delivery of the site. The County Council, as local highways authority, has reiterated its desire for a park and ride to support delivery of the site. Accordingly, reference with the SPD to a park and ride site to possibly support delivery is considered appropriate.
247.	Resident 226	4.6 Land Uses	Suggests detail is lacking regarding primary school layouts, employment land uses and the location of a park and ride.	The layout of the primary schools would be determined through full planning applications. In accordance with local plan policy for the site, employment uses generally include warehousing, logistics, industrial processes and office uses. It is not possible or appropriate to be more prescriptive within the SPD itself. A park and ride to the north of the site adjacent to the A52 has been proposed by the County Council for several years but a detailed location has not yet been confirmed and therefore cannot be identified within the SPD.
248.	Resident 71 Resident 72 Resident 73 Resident 80	4.6 Land Uses	Concern there will be development of new homes adjacent to Tollerton Park	The SPD clearly establishes a school campus and a central green space as uses neighbouring Tollerton Park. Notwithstanding

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 110 Resident 125 Resident 145 Resident 149			this, residential development would not be incompatible adjacent to Tollerton Park.
249.	Resident 206 Resident 221	Community facilities	Lack of binding guarantees that education and medical facilities will be provided. Provision does not seem to adequately feature in the SPD.	The SPD identifies that new schools and health facilities to meet the needs of new residents is expected. The SPD is not a legal document and cannot offer binding guarantees.
250.	Resident 219	Community facilities	The document suggests that facilities such as education, recreation and retail will be provided within 10 minutes walk but there is no detail of how this will be delivered, where is the network of paths?	<p>The SPD indicates the broad active travel network for the site, but more details would be established as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>At paragraph 4.80 the reference to access to facilities within 10 minutes should refer to walking distance and that this should ideally be the case.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Change paragraph 4.80 (bullet point 3) to the following text: 'Legible (and clearly signed), direct, safe, lit and surveilled cycling routes through and around the development which allow access to local facilities <u>ideally</u> within 10 minutes <u>walking distance</u>, and link into existing networks beyond the development's boundary,'</p>
251.	Resident 219	Community facilities	There are no timelines in the document for the delivery of key services and	The SPD establishes the broad infrastructure requirements, and more details about what and

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			facilities. Spire Hospital is indicated as an existing service and facility, however it is private and does not serve the community.	when will be established subsequently at the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and planning application stage (including within section 106 legal agreements).
252.	Resident 222	Healthcare facilities	Lack of clarity around how you have determined that the NHS GP provision can manage 16,000 new patients.	The NHS provision is and will be calculated using the NHS's required standards. This is stated in the SPD.
253.	Active Travel England	Land uses	<p><u>Land Uses</u></p> <p>Neighbourhood Centres (p.46): Design must prioritise active/sustainable access.</p> <p>Employment (p.48): Require active travel integration and robust travel plans.</p> <p>Education: Strengthen sustainable access requirements; include cycle parking standards, lockers, drying facilities; design schools with active travel front and centre.</p>	<p>The neighbourhood centres' indicative locations are close to primary streets which will have segregated cycle provision, they are also connected to traffic free routes through the site.</p> <p>The Active Travel section at 4.67 sets out that proposals must be informed by Active Travel principles and Access and Movement diagram (Figure 35) which illustrates how the different land uses on site will be expended to be well served and connected by active travel corridors throughout the site – including as part of the primary and secondary street networks.</p> <p>It is considered the SPD (with the addition of a new active travel related design objective) appropriately covers Active Travel matters in sufficient detail at this stage, ahead of more detailed requirements being established within the IDP and are part of the planning application process.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
254.	Resident 23	Retail and leisure	Concerns over insufficient retail and leisure offering in surrounding towns and lack of parking.	There are large essential retail offerings at nearby Gamston and Edwalton and a significant retail offering in West Bridgford. Improvements to infrastructure and public transport through development will make these further accessible. Besides this there are community leisure and retail facilities planned on the site.
255.	Resident 226	4.65 Secondary Streets	Questions lack of detail on tertiary streets (widths etc.)	It was considered necessary to go into this level of detail for residential development within the SPD. However the Site-Wide Design Code at Appendix 1 to the SPD indicates that street network will require more detail in subsequent Area Design Codes for the site.
256.	Cllr Richard Butler	4.66 Public Transport	Queries what guarantees and protections are in place to ensure public transport services will be run at a practical rate.	The SPD says that it is anticipated the development would be served by bus around every 10 minutes. While there are not mechanisms available within an SPD to indefinitely guarantee levels of bus service, planning stops and roads for this level of provision best enables the local transport bodies to provide it. A public transport strategy is required before determination of the first planning application for the site and, as part of this, it is expected to identify the need for interim arrangement for layover facilities for operators to facilitate early delivery of a bus service for the early occupiers of the site.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
257.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.66 Public Transport	Questions the standard of bus frequency that would be provided on site	The public transport section states an anticipated frequency of a bus around every 10 minutes into Nottingham City Centre
258.	Resident 60 Resident 61 Resident 98 Resident 144 Resident 232 Resident 255 Resident 266 Resident 271 Resident 275 Resident 283	4.66 Public Transport Strategy	Concerned that public transport arrangements have yet to be formalised.	Bus services have recently been improved and will continue to be improved as demand is consolidated through the development. A public transport strategy is required before determination of the first planning application for the site. As part of this, it is expected to identify the need for interim arrangement for layover facilities for operators to facilitate early delivery of a bus service for the early occupiers of the site. Additionally, the design code states standards for public transport infrastructure including that most residential dwellings must be within 400m of a bus stop.
259.	Cllr Steve Calvert Resident 208	4.67 Active Travel	Requests stronger wording to avoid "departures" from the required pedestrian and cycle access improvements	<p>The wording of the paragraph is not clear and departures should be where this is to satisfaction of the local planning authority.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Using part of the text within paragraph 4.67, create a new paragraph following it with the following text: 'A segregated two-way cycle track will be delivered along Primary Streets through the development, with a shared footway/cycle track provided, unless departures from this requirement have been demonstrated to the Highway, and Local Planning Authorities as appropriate and are</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<p><u>agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Local Highway Authority.</u> The proposals must have been informed by Active Travel principles. All future planning applications must demonstrate compliance with the same principles.'</p>
260.	Cllr Steve Calvert Resident 113	4.67 Active Travel	Concerned that Bridleway 5 is currently blocked at the A52 by National Highways and that there is no plan to rectify this.	Bridleway 5 Crosses the A52 to the south of the allocation and so is not subject to this SPD although as stated, contributions will be secured for off-site infrastructure. The proposed locations of new junctions where upgrades will be made to pedestrian and cycle crossing arrangements are highlighted in the Movement Framework.
261.	Grantham Canal Society Canal and River Trust Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council Resident 38 Resident 44 Resident 141 Resident 155 Resident 197	4.67 Active Travel	Suggests pedestrian access via tunnels/underpasses at the Grantham canal	Reinstating a towpath beside the canal under the A52 is not one of the access options considered within the SPD and it is anticipated that it would be a problematic and expensive option to pursue to support pedestrian and cyclist access for the site, when alternative options exist. This arrangement is likely also dependent on National Highways work to upgrade the A52.
262.	Grantham Canal Society	4.67 Active Travel	Raises the potential for the development to contribute to reconnection of the canal to the River Trent	The SPD acknowledges the importance of the Grantham Canal as a green infrastructure corridor and active travel work, helping to

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				connect the site and wider area. The document focuses on improvements to the setting and accessibility of the canal along the northern edge of the site however contributions to off-site infrastructure may be an opportunity to fund improvements to the canal tow path, particularly regarding active travel infrastructure. However, in respect of reconnecting the canal of the River Trent, there is not a clear case to justify why this is necessary to support the development of the site. Opening up the canal under the A52 is not one of the access options considered within the SPD and it is anticipated that it would be a problematic and expensive option to pursue, when alternative options exist. This arrangement is likely also dependent on National Highways work to upgrade the A52.
263.	Pedals Resident 76 Resident 144 Resident 196 Resident 147 Resident 250 Resident 281	4.67 Active Travel	Request the SPD proposes improvements to existing active travel infrastructure and connections to it.	The SPD proposes that the new active travel infrastructure will connect to routes in Gamston through improvements to at grade crossings on the A52, a potential new bridge crossing (see response and modification below under ref 282) and the existing crossing north of Tollerton Lane junction. While the SPD does not propose what specific improvements are required to active travel infrastructure off the site, funding will be secured for reasonable and necessary improvements through planning permissions and associated Section 106s.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
264.	Resident 104	4.67 Active Travel	Requests consultation with local cyclists on planned cycle improvements relating to the site.	All planning applications within the site, which include details in respect of strategic infrastructure such as cycle lanes, will be consulted on with appropriate consultees as is standard. The Council welcomes the input and advice of local cyclists.
265.	Resident 111	4.67 Active Travel	Concern that the desire to promote walking and cycling will not necessarily prompt behaviour change	It is true that behaviour change cannot always be affected by physical intervention alone. There are various schemes by local authorities and other stakeholders looking to promote behaviour change, specifically through walking and cycling. These will need to be continued to bring about real change.
266.	Resident 111	4.67 Active Travel	Concern that dualling the A52 will exacerbate the traffic issues currently experienced and create further issues with pedestrian access across the road.	Some of the primary infrastructure improvements identified as necessary for development to happen include upgrades of pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities over the A52. A host of transport upgrades were identified in the Local Plan Part 1: Core strategy as necessary for the development to come forward. These include the upgrade to the A52 but also include improvements to walking and cycling links locally and upgrading and expanding the local bus services.
267.	Resident 123	4.67 Active Travel	Suggests cycle provision in conjunction with major junctions will likely discourage cycling between the site and the surrounding area.	Delivery of cycle connections alongside junctions will ensure cycle access is secured early in the development. Further active travel connections will be considered alongside junction improvements as the site is developed.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
268.	Resident 128	4.67 Active Travel	Suggests the size and location of active travel routes is unclear	The access and movement strategy diagram shows the indicative layout for the primary and secondary streets as well as shared foot and cycleways. The strategy states that all primary routes will have a 3m segregated cycleway and a 2m dedicated footway. It also establishes that the shared walking and cycling routes will be a 3m shared foot and cycleway.
269.	Resident 136	4.67 Active Travel	Expresses support for active travel provision across the site.	As established in SPD, including the site wide design code, there is expected to be extensive active travel provision including the implementation of cycleways along primary routes and shared foot and cycle paths through new green space.
270.	Resident 138	4.67 Active Travel	Queries what active travel provision there will be along the Grantham Canal	The canal towpath currently allows for walking and cycling and this would continue.
271.	Resident 196 Resident 212	4.67 Active Travel	Traffic volumes on roads in the area around the development are very likely to increase, and potentially quite significantly, as a result of the development - therefore improved facilities for pedestrians & cyclists should also be provided across this wider area.. A good starting point would be a segregated cycle path along the full length of Tollerton Lane. However, it should not stop there and more should also be done for Cotgrave Lane and Cotgrave / Plumtree Road.	As outlined by the SPD, a range of contributions will be sought for necessary off-site infrastructure including active travel improvements. Such works may be directly delivered by the site developers.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
272.	Resident 37 Resident 169 Resident 172 Resident 175 Resident 197 Resident 230 Resident 245 Resident 255 Resident 256	4.67 Active Travel	Concerns over pedestrian access, suggest various bridges	<p>Pedestrian access arrangements will be dealt with through full planning applications. The SPD requires that upgrades to existing crossings and new at grade crossings will be established early on to enable phased build out to begin.</p> <p>It is accepted that the potential option of a foot and cycle bridge needs to be explicitly referenced in the SPD – see Modification below at ref 282.</p>
273.	Resident 48 Resident 172 Resident 191 Resident 197	4.67 Active Travel	Objects to the provision of active travel access at grade and suggests a bridge be delivered through a section 106 Agreement	<p>Improvements to pedestrian crossings are some of the first infrastructure required for the site to come forward. At grade improvements are deemed to be the most deliverable as these can be made in conjunction with reconfiguration of the Road Network. Further access arrangements will have to come forward through full planning applications and will involve assessment of the feasibility and cost as well as input from the highways authority.</p> <p>It is accepted that the potential option of a foot and cycle bridge needs to be explicitly referenced in the SPD – see Modification below at ref 282.</p>
274.	Resident 48 Resident 191	4.67 Active Travel	Concern the SPD lacks detail of required active travel infrastructure beyond the site	The SPD primarily establishes a high-level approach to active travel measures within the

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>to Morrisons at Gamston or other local schools</p> <p>Concerned that figures 20 and 35 do not show FP6 and FP15 as access points to the site although these form the existing pedestrian interface with the land.</p> <p>Concerned movement circulation diagrams are preoccupied with vehicular movement and do not clearly portray active travel routes</p>	<p>site. It is not accepted that movement related plans and diagrams are preoccupied with vehicular movement. The access and movement strategy for instance indicates the location of the active travel corridors and strategic foot and cycle track network.</p> <p>More detailed requirements, both within and beyond the site, will be established through the IDP and planning application process. It is expected this will include off site active travel improvements, but specifically where and in what form is not yet established in detail.</p>
275.	Resident 69 Resident 169	4.67 Active Travel	<p>Requests following improvements to active travel and public transport infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Footpath along Tollerton Lane - Allowances made for future tram extension - Pedestrian access over the A52 at Edwalton Golf Course - Provision of a new cycle path connecting to the new bridge at Lady Bay 	<p>Upgrades to Tollerton Lane will include a footway alongside it in line with the design code. There are currently no plans for a tram route through the site although there is ambition for a new park and ride facility off the A52 further north. The mentioned footpath crosses the A52 south of the site and is not planned to be improved but safer pedestrian crossings will be delivered between Gamston and the development. The SPD establishes a need to establish connections with existing and planned cycle routes including the Grantham Canal towpath and those within West Bridford and to the new bridge at Lady Bay.</p>
276.	Resident 80 Resident 90 Resident 91	4.67 Active Travel	Requests for safe cycle provision along Tollerton Lane including 30mph speed limit and foot and cycleway either side	The SPD establishes that along all primary streets in the development there will be adjacent segregated cycleways and for all

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 92 Resident 93 Resident 94 Resident 96 Resident 97 Resident 99 Resident 100 Resident 103 Resident 104 Resident 119 Resident 131 Resident 134 Resident 135 Resident 140 Resident 185 Resident 188 Resident 191 Resident 193 Resident 196 Resident 232 Resident 236 Resident 28			secondary streets and leisure routes there will be a 3m wide shared foot and cycleway adjacent. While Tollerton Lane will not be a primary street this will ensure safe routes from Tollerton to the urban area. The SPD also establishes a need for traffic managements measures between the site and Tollerton village.
277.	Tollerton Parish Council Resident 22 Resident 60 Resident 275	4.67 Active Travel	Suggests the active travel element of the scheme is lacking credibility and risks entrenching car dependency	Amongst a number of provisions within the SPD to provide for and support active travel, the document explicitly states the active travel infrastructure will be designed to established standards including: LTN 1/20 standard cycleways, Manual for Streets and the County Council's 'Highway Design Guide' standards for streets, Sport England's Active Design

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				guidance for walkability and to promote active travel.
278.	Active Travel England	Active travel	<p>Vision -Current vision lacks clarity on transport; should explicitly address active travel and barriers (e.g., A52 crossing). Include off-site desire lines to West Bridgford/ Nottingham. Strengthen language beyond “encouraging” active travel; set firm expectations.</p> <p>Elsewhere in the document there is insufficient emphasis on active travel and some of the details within the SPD could be improved.</p>	The SPD goes as far as it reasonably can at this stage in respect of active travel until more detailed is established in the IDP and as part of the planning application process. Except, that it is considered appropriate to include reference to the potential option of a bridge across the A52 for pedestrian and cyclist and make clear that this option should be that this should be assessed alongside an at-grade crossing option. See the Modification below – ref 282.
279.	Active Travel England	Active travel	<p><u>Connectivity</u></p> <p>Section misses active travel requirements; add bullet points referencing NPPF and LTN 1/20. Show strategic links across A52; move connectivity under Movement Framework.</p>	The adherence with LTN 1/20 is referenced within the document. The document establishes that active travel links across the A52 will be established as part of early phases of the scheme
280.	Active Travel England	Active travel	<p><u>Mobility hubs and Street Design</u></p> <p>Various comments are made the mobility hubs and street design and the need for further detail is requested. For example, for Primary streets: clarify segregation; avoid long straight sections; ensure active frontage. For</p>	<p>The document specifies that active frontage will be sought where buildings front the public realm. The requirement for continuous cycle route with minimised access to driveways to avoid crossovers is identified.</p> <p>A number of detailed comments made by Active Travel England would be expected to be</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			Secondary streets: reduce on-plot parking; consider car-free street strategies.	more appropriately addressed as part of the planning application process.
281.	Active Travel England	Active travel	<p><u>Movement Framework (p.64)</u></p> <p>Link to ATE toolkit and advice.</p> <p>Address A52 crossing explicitly; uncontrolled PRoW crossings are unsuitable.</p> <p>Include mobility hubs with cargo/adaptable cycle hire; clarify segregated vs shared routes.</p>	<p>A change has been made to include more explicit mention of provision of primary means of crossing the A52 for pedestrians and cyclists. See the Modification below – ref 282. Facilities to be provided at mobility hubs are also outlined in the document.</p> <p>The SPD specifies primary roads will have segregated cycle provision while secondary ones will be shared surfaces for all modes. It is also detailed that leisure routes off street will have a shared foot and cycle way.</p>
282.	Active Travel England	Active travel	Concern that the challenges of crossing the A52 by active travel modes is overlooked and concern over at-grade A52 crossings; need evidence-based design and lack of insufficient coverage within the SPD to these crossings.	<p>It is agreed that solutions for achieving access for pedestrians and cyclists across the A52 Lings Bar need to be based on evidence. As part of this, it is accepted that the potential option of a foot and cycle bridge needs to be explicitly referenced in the SPD.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>At paragraph 4.67, including the following text:</p> <p><u>'A primary route for pedestrians and cyclists to move between the site and Gamston centre will need to be provided. This could be the provision of a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the A52, or it could be at-grade controlled'</u></p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<p><u>crossings on the A52 between the site and Ambleside. Determination of the most suitable option to achieve pedestrian and cycle connectivity and safety should be informed by a crossing options analysis as part of the transport assessment for the proposed development.</u></p> <p>At the Delivery Strategy chapter (chapter 5) include as a new bullet point to 'B Off-site infrastructure' the following text:</p> <p><u>• A52 crossing options analysis for pedestrians and cyclists – the transport assessment work for the proposed development will need to include a crossing options analysis to determine the most suitable primary route for pedestrians and cyclists between the site and Gamston centre, which shall include analysis of:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>– a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the A52; and</u> <u>– at-grade controlled crossings on the A52 between the site and Ambleside.</u> <p><u>The costs and benefits of each option shall be set out, including the contribution towards pedestrian and cycle connectivity and safety.</u></p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				<p>Within Whole Site Transport Infrastructure table at Chapter 5 includes, as a new Active Travel Item, the following text:</p> <p><u>'Implementation of primary route for pedestrians and cyclists between the site and Gamton centre, to be achieved either by:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>– a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the A52;</u> <u>or</u> <u>– at-grade controlled crossings on the A52 between the site and Ambleside'.</u> <p>With its trigger being: '<u>Delivery trigger to be agreed</u>, but likely to be early delivery.'</p>
283.	Notts CTC	Active travel	<p>It is commendable that the SPD makes much reference to the provision of good facilities for pedestrians & cyclists. There is also reference to existing formal is such as the National Cycle Network. However, what does not appear to have been recognised is the extent to which Tollerton Lane, Cotgrave Lane and Cotgrave / Plumtree Road are used currently by relatively large numbers of leisure cyclists in order to gain access to the Vale of Belvoir. As well as providing good facilities for pedestrians & cyclists within the development and for access into the Gamston & West Bridgford areas, it will also be important to improve significantly the infrastructure for pedestrians and</p>	<p>Segregated cycleways are to be implemented across all primary roads on the development as identified within the SPD. While the SPD does not propose what specific improvements are required to active travel infrastructure off the site, funding will be secured for reasonable and necessary improvements through planning permissions and associated Section 106 agreements. The County Council and the East Midlands Combined County Authority will continue to look for opportunities to improve active travel infrastructure across the borough.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>cyclists within a wider area around the development - perhaps within a 5km radius around the development. A good starting point would be a segregated cycle path along the full length of Tollerton Lane. However, it should not stop there and more should also be done for Cotgrave Lane and Cotgrave / Plumtree Road.</p>	
284.	Resident 232 Resident 236 Resident 237 Resident 247 Resident 276 Resident 283 Resident 289	Active travel	<p>Requests more enforceable commitment to active travel infrastructure including at Wheatcroft Island</p>	<p>While the SPD does not propose what specific improvements are required to active travel infrastructure off the site, funding will be secured for reasonable and necessary improvements through planning permissions and associated section 106s agreements. This may not include active travel infrastructure at Wheatcroft Island, but provision of improved pedestrian and cycling crossings at this point are expected as part of National Highways' programmed works for this junction. County Council</p>
285.	Resident 247	Active travel	<p>Requests improvements to active travel provision in Tollerton are delivered earlier in the development to protect pedestrians from the increase in traffic</p>	<p>Active travel improvements in Tollerton Village will depend on the recommendations of the ongoing transport assessment work, however the SPD establishes that traffic management measures between the site and Tollerton will need to be implemented through planning permissions.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
286.	Active Travel England	Transport	<p><u>Development Framework</u></p> <p>Design Objectives (p.44–45): Add explicit movement objective prioritising active/sustainable travel.</p> <p>Greenways and linear parks: ensure routes are suitable for everyday trips (lit, all-weather, safe).</p> <p>Movement & Circulation: address A52 crossing and developer responsibilities for active travel.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Areas: prevent disconnected layouts; promote permeability and active frontages.</p>	<p>The provision of strategic active travel infrastructure alongside the primary streets demonstrates that walking and cycling are a priority within the development as does the addition of a network of active travel routes off road. Specification of the routes provided will be informed by LTN 1/20 as stated.</p> <p>The document specifies that strategic infrastructure including active travel is a shared responsibility of all developers on site.</p> <p>The SPD states that buildings fronting onto public realm should have active frontages and overlook the street.</p> <p>A change has been made to include more explicit mention of provision of primary means of crossing the A52 for pedestrians and cyclists. See the Modification above at ref 282</p>
287.	Notts County Council (Property)	Transport	<p>There are a number of weaknesses in the work undertaken to date to assess the transport impacts of development and in the transport mitigation details included in the SPD. For example, the provision of multiple active travel crossings of the A52 is a fundamental part Local Plan policy for the site and no presentation of a grade separated solution has been presented.</p>	<p>The transport assessment work for proposed development of the site is still ongoing and it is not prudent to wait for its completion and outcomes before the SPD is adopted, for the reasons set out above at Ref 231.</p> <p>The need for a potential active travel bridge across the A52 to be considered further has now been added to the SPD (see above at Ref 282).</p>
288.	Notts CTC	Transport	Notts CTC organises more than 200 group rides per year and a relatively high	There are traffic calming interventions proposed to reduce the impact on the

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>proportion of these rides use roads that are likely to see an increase in traffic levels as a result of the proposed development. Furthermore, many of our members use these roads on other occasions - both for leisure and for more purposeful active travel. Many of our members feel strongly that those actions that are proposed in support of active travel and that are associated with the proposed development, are inadequate - and much more needs to be done, both to protect those who already use these roads for cycling & walking and to encourage more people to do so.</p>	<p>mentioned road although it is accepted that traffic generally will increase as a result of development. The County Council and the East Midlands Combined County Authority will continue to bring forward schemes which encourage behaviour change and improve active travel infrastructure.</p>
289.	Pedals	Transport	Propose traffic calming in Gamston District Centre as well as Tollerton	While the SPD does not identify if specific traffic calming measures will be required off the site, funding will be secured for any reasonable and necessary improvements through planning permissions and associated Section 106 agreements.
290.	Pedals	Transport	Request early and comprehensive delivery of signage to external destinations and bus links. Also attention to detail in cycle facility design e.g. appropriate surface treatment, good lighting etc	The requests are noted. The site wide design code includes as a mandatory requirement within the access and movement section the requirement for development to include signage to facilitate wayfinding and legibility.
291.	Pedals	Transport	List of external links recommended for improvement	While the SPD does not propose what specific improvements are required to active travel

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gamston to West Bridgford Via Grantham Canal (F13) - Regatta Way to Radcliffe Road and Waterside Bridge - Safe routes to Tollerton, Plumtree, Keyworth and BGS site. - Burleigh Road-Nearsby Drive link - BW6 to Bassingfield 	infrastructure off the site, funding will be secured for reasonable and necessary improvements through planning permissions and associated section 106s agreements. The Council notes the advice provided in respect of recommended improvements.
292.	Pedals	Transport	Request cycle infrastructure avoids making cyclists switch sides of the road mid route as per LTN 1/20	The Design Code states cycleways will be designed in accordance with the principles of LTN 1/20
293.	Pedals	Transport	Objects to provision of active travel connections at grade and proposes two bridges, one at the junction with Ambleside and another further south e.g. FP6	<p>The SPD establishes that at grade crossings will be delivered in the first stage of development in conjunction with new road connections to the A52. Further active travel links will be subject to full planning applications</p> <p>It is accepted that the potential option of a foot and cycle bridge needs to be explicitly referenced in the SPD – see Modification above at ref 282.</p>
294.	Resident 219	Transport	There are no pedestrian or cycle routes indicated to key destinations on the plans or where improvements will be made	The SPD and its site wide design code both specify the provision of active travel infrastructure adjacent to primary streets as well as the provision along leisure routes. These connect various destinations within the development.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
295.	Grantham Canal Society	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Request the Memorandum of Understanding for the A52 and A606 upgrades include provision for the canal towpath to pass under the A52	While the comments are noted, the Memorandum of Understanding is separate to the SPD and outside its remit.
296.	Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council Cllr Debbie Mason Resident 2 Resident 7 Resident 18 Resident 33 Resident 39 Resident 43 Resident 50 Resident 54 Resident 56 Resident 60 Resident 61 Resident 76 Resident 79 Resident 84 Resident 87 Resident 90 Resident 98 Resident 107 Resident 108 Resident 115 Resident 116	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Concerns over how any traffic calming or junction restrictions will be implemented	Traffic calming measures are outlined by the document particularly regarding movement along Tollerton Lane. Suggestions include mode restricting parts of Tollerton Lane and diverting traffic along the new primary routes. The SPD also highlights speed limits and traffic calming and management measures within the site, and beyond to Tollerton village to disincentivise or prevent through traffic.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 117 Resident 118 Resident 121 Resident 128 Resident 143 Resident 144 Resident 149 Resident 151 Resident 159 Resident 160 Resident 162 Resident 171 Resident 174 Resident 180 Resident 185 Resident 190 Resident 196 Resident 219 Resident 226 Resident 230 Resident 234 Resident 236 Resident 237 Resident 239 Resident 245 Resident 250 Resident 252 Resident 254 Resident 255 Resident 275 Resident 277			

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 279 Resident 281 Resident 282			
297.	Resident 113 Resident 130 Resident 276	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Concern over lack of measures set out to prevent use of Bassingfield Lane to access the site from the A52 westbound.	It is proposed mention is included at paragraph 3.65 to better ensure that the impact of additional traffic through the village of Tollerton <u>and Bassingfield</u> will be carefully considered and suitable mitigation measures adopted and implemented to ensure that traffic levels are maintained to an acceptable minimum level. See the modification below at ref 236.
298.	Resident 12 Resident 15 Resident 17 Resident 18 Resident 20 Resident 23 Resident 26 Resident 34 Resident 35 Resident 37 Resident 39 Resident 41 Resident 42 Resident 47 Resident 62 Resident 121 Resident 161 Resident 252	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Expresses need for change to the road system around the suburbs south of the River Trent and solutions to congestion	Development of strategic sites south of the River Trent is anticipated to produce a marked increase in the amount of traffic on the road network. This is why a programme of improvement works to A52 junctions in the east, south and west of West Bridgford, was identified as necessary for development of such sites in the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2010). While National Highways has agreed to upgrade A52 junctions between the A6005 (QMC) and the A46 (Bingham), the focus of the SPD and wider development plan policy is reducing the use of private vehicles by locating the majority of housing close to public amenities, public transport links and employment opportunities.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 266 Resident 271 Resident 284 Resident 285 Resident 290			
299.	Resident 120	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Concern the SPD does not contain comparable detail to that of the Melton Road SPD particularly with regard to access arrangements.	These are different sites, with different circumstances. To include a comparable level of detail would require transport assessment work to be completed. The reasons for not delaying the SPD's completion until after transport assessment work is completed are set out above at ref 231
300.	Resident 16 Resident 243	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	There should not be a reliance on National Highways planned A52 upgrades..	Planned A52 works at Radcliffe on Trent and the Gamston roundabout (the A52/A6011) have already been completed and planned major works at the Wheatcroft and Nottingham Knight roundabouts are now programmed to begin during 2026. It is appropriate place reliance on these works helping to support the site's development.
301.	Resident 46 Resident 208 Resident 211	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Requests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completion and publication of comprehensive traffic modelling coordinated between National Highways and the County Council - Development of a detailed and deliverable access strategy that sets out responsibilities and timetables for delivery 	These details cannot be fully established at this stage, ahead of the completion of transport work. The SPD provides the necessary framework to allow transport mitigation requirements to be subsequently established within the IDP and as part of planning permissions.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusion of a fully costed and funded mitigation measures with particular emphasis on protecting Tollerton Village from adverse traffic impacts 	The reasons for not delaying the SPD's completion until after transport assessment work is completed are set out ref 231.
302.	Resident 55 Resident 209	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	<p>Requests complete and published transport modelling before SPD is adopted alongside:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Single and deliverable access strategy with National Highways and Nottinghamshire County Council - Costed mitigation measures for trunk and local roads - Clear plans to protect Tollerton Village from congestion 	<p>These details cannot be fully established at this stage, ahead of the completion of transport work. The SPD provides the necessary framework to allow transport mitigation requirements to be subsequently established within the IDP and as part of planning permissions.</p> <p>The reasons for not delaying the SPD's completion until after transport assessment work is completed are set out above at ref 231.</p>
303.	Resident 6 Resident 226	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	<p>Concerns over lack of detail as to how real accessibility will be secured.</p> <p>Requests comprehensive infrastructure and employment strategy before development of the site</p>	While there are proposals for favoured access arrangements within the SPD, more detailed road access arrangements will be established by the IDP and planning permissions.
304.	Resident 71 Resident 72 Resident 110 Resident 115 Resident 125 Resident 145 Resident 149 Resident 156 Resident 246	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Concerns over noise from increased traffic and school neighbouring Tollerton Park.	It is Local Plan policy that, in respect of new developments, noise attenuation is achieved and light pollution is minimised. This policy will be applied in deciding planning applications for development and attaching conditions to planning permissions.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
305.	Resident 75	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Concern over lack of construction phasing plan. Requests development start from the southern edge to reduce impact on local communities	Development phasing is contingent on complex factors including remediation work and delivery of strategic road infrastructure and therefore it is difficult at present to be prescriptive over phasing of development. The SPD does establish however, that the northern portion of the site is likely to be developed first being accessed via the first of several new junctions on the A52.
306.	Tollerton Parish Council Resident 60 Resident 61 Resident 70 Resident 79 Resident 83 Resident 108 Resident 110 Resident 151 Resident 211 Resident 226 Resident 236 Resident 237 Resident 239 Resident 245 Resident 252 Resident 255 Resident 258 Resident 260 Resident 261 Resident 263	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Concern that there is no agreed transport strategy with the County Council as the highways authority. There is a lack of consistency and clarity on proposed access works and movement strategy	These details cannot be fully established at this stage, ahead of the completion of transport work. The SPD provides the necessary framework to allow transport mitigation requirements to be subsequently established within the IDP and as part of planning permissions. The reasons for not delaying the SPD's completion until after transport assessment work is completed are set out above at ref 231.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 266 Resident 273 Resident 274 Resident 275 Resident 277 Resident 279 Resident 281 Resident 283 Resident 285 Resident 286 Resident 288 Resident 289			
307.	Tollerton Parish Council Resident 50 Resident 60 Resident 61 Resident 79 Resident 83 Resident 98 Resident 101 Resident 116 Resident 117 Resident 118 Resident 121 Resident 124 Resident 126 Resident 149 Resident 174 Resident 188 Resident 224	4.68 Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy	Concern the number and type of access points from the A52 are undefined.	The SPD establishes that three junctions with the A52 will be required and the rough locations for these. The arrangements for these will be further specified through transport modelling and planning application process.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 226 Resident 236 Resident 239 Resident 245 Resident 255 Resident 260 Resident 261 Resident 273 Resident 275 Resident 277 Resident 281 Resident 283 Resident 285 Resident 287			
308.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.68 Vehicular movement strategy	Requests definition of "first phase" of development by number of dwellings.	The first phase of the development does not refer to a specific number of dwellings but a parcel of land on the northern side of the site which will require development of a new junction to be built out.
309.	National Highways	4.68 Vehicular Movement Strategy	Attention is drawn to Department for Transport (DfT) revised Circular 01/2022 - Strategic Road Network and the delivery of sustainable development which sets out that the SRN is not being relied upon for the transport accessibility of site a/locations except where this relates to roadside facilities or SRN-dependent sectors (such as logistics and manufacturing).	It has already been established by the Rushcliffe Part 1 Core Strategy that the new junctions on the A52 will be the primary means for road traffic accessing the site.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
310.	Resident 129	4.68 Vehicular Movement Strategy	Concerned over lack of detail on road improvements across the entire area	There are planned road improvements to the A52 which are being carried out by National Highways, the design of which will be released in due course.
311.	Resident 133 Resident 137 Resident 150 Resident 152 Resident 157 Resident 164 Resident 166 Resident 168 Resident 171 Resident 175 Resident 177 Resident 180 Resident 181 Resident 183 Resident 186 Resident 214 Resident 226 Resident 233 Resident 236 Resident 241 Resident 244 Resident 248 Resident 249 Resident 250 Resident 252 Resident 253 Resident 257	4.68 Vehicular Movement Strategy	Concern that traffic congestion resulting from the development will be severe, limiting the network's ability to cope and causing significant stress and mental health impacts for residents.	The A52 works at Radcliffe on Trent and the Gamston roundabout (the A52/A6011) have already been completed and planned major works at the Wheatcroft and Nottingham Knight roundabouts are now programmed to begin during 2026. As made clear in the 2024 Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, these works support the site's development. New access junctions and upgrades to the A52 are expected to be delivered early in the development to manage additional traffic and mitigate congestion. The SPD also prioritises active travel and enhanced public transport to reduce reliance on private vehicles, ensuring sustainable movement across the site. Measures such as landscaped buffers, acoustic fencing where appropriate, and traffic-calming interventions will be implemented to protect residential amenity.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 261 Resident 263 Resident 266 Resident 268 Resident 271 Resident 277 Resident 280 Resident 282 Resident 284 Resident 288 Resident 290			
312.	Resident 138 Resident 142 Resident 147 Resident 272	4.68 Vehicular Movement Strategy	Concerned how residents will get out of Tollerton if access North along Tollerton Lane is closed	The SPD proposes a potential bus gate and improvements to active travel infrastructure on Tollerton Lane to ensure access to amenities on the site and in Gamston is maintained for residents. Closing of access to private vehicles would likely be subject to monitoring of traffic over the course of development. Other existing routes would remain
313.	Resident 139 Resident 245	4.68 Vehicular Movement Strategy	Suggests mitigation measures for existing traffic is inadequate and discredits the transport strategy.	The SPD establishes the need for active travel and public transport to be the primary modes within the development and sets out design interventions to encourage this. There are further mitigations such as potentially installing a bus gate and other traffic calming and management measures which will be furthered informed through the ongoing transport assessment.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
314.	Resident 142	4.68 Vehicular Movement Strategy	Concern there is no mention of Compulsory Purchase orders to widen roads	The planned works to the A52 being undertaken by National Highways are taking place independent of this development and as such provisions for this are not made in the SPD. At present, there is no assumption that compulsory purchase orders would be required in respect of highway works directly required by this development.
315.	Resident 202 Resident 204 Resident 211 Resident 216 Resident 219 Resident 220 Resident 221	4.68 Vehicular Movement Strategy	Concern over traffic impact through Tollerton village and existing traffic levels. Roads referred to include Burnside Grove, Stansted Avenue and Tollerton Lane	Proposed traffic calming measures include the potential restriction of Tollerton Lane for private vehicles. Any interventions will be informed by the emerging transport assessment work.
316.	Resident 226	Highways	Questions why indicative secondary and tertiary street sections are not presented.	Indicative streets are presented but tertiary street sections are unnecessary to be illustrated at this stage and in this SPD.
317.	Resident 259 Normanton on the Wolds Parish Council	Highways	Requests upgrades to road infrastructure include improvements to the A606 before any building begins.	The ongoing transport assessment will determine in more detail what improvements to infrastructure are required for the site to come forward, the SPD establishes that contributions will also be sought for off-site infrastructure.
318.	Vistry Homes Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land	Highways	Suggests some detail on primary and secondary streets may not be necessary in the body of the SPD if it is laid out within the design code.	The comment is noted but it does not weaken the document to have the details in both the body of the SPD and in the site wide design code.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
319.	Resident 1 Resident 166 Resident 193 Resident 196 Resident 242	Sustainable Transport Strategy	Requests public transport and active travel links to the built up area be more specific to encourage safe sustainable connections to amenities without encouraging general traffic. Requests traffic to Tollerton be emergency service and active travel only.	While there are indicative access arrangements within the SPD, more detailed road access will need to be established at the planning application stage. Access to Tollerton via Tollerton Lane will be the subject of appropriate traffic management measures.
320.	Cllr Richard Butler Resident 31 Resident 40 Resident 43 Resident 44 Resident 55 Resident 56 Resident 57 Resident 58 Resident 65 Resident 66 Resident 70 Resident 73 Resident 76 Resident 84 Resident 87 Resident 89 Resident 90 Resident 101 Resident 105 Resident 109 Resident 110 Resident 111	Transport	Concern for lack of detail regarding access to the site from the A52 considering prevalence of RTAs at current junctions. Concern over lack of traffic flow data presented as part of the SPD. Request that no housebuilding on site is commenced before the new access and road layouts have been established and proven adequate to accommodate the increased flows expected.	The SPD establishes that the first phase of development will be accessed from the A52's junction with Tollerton Lane, following improvements to it, which are to be decided through the planning application process. Based on assessment work undertaken to date, it is expected that there will need to be junction improvements at Tollerton Lane and the development of two new junctions from the site on to the A52. The detailed design and delivery arrangements for which will be established within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and planning permissions for the site (including within associated section 106 legal agreements). The detailed arrangements will need to be scrutinised by National Highways and the local highways authority. It is identified in the SPD that new access junctions and upgrades to the A52 are expected to be delivered early in the development to manage additional traffic and mitigate congestion, but identification of more specifically when is dependent on the outcomes of the transport modelling work. Agreed triggers for delivery

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 113 Resident 115 Resident 124 Resident 126 Resident 127 Resident 128 Resident 129 Resident 132 Resident 142 Resident 144 Resident 148 Resident 155 Resident 156 Resident 162 Resident 170 Resident 174 Resident 188 Resident 192 Resident 219 Resident 224 Resident 226 Resident 231 Resident 233 Resident 234 Resident 235 Resident 237 Resident 239 Resident 249 Resident 254 Resident 260 Resident 262			would then be secured through planning conditions and, where necessary, the inclusion of relevant details within section 106 agreements.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 274 Resident 277 Resident 285 Resident 286 Resident 287			
321.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport	<p><u>Movement & Design Standards</u></p> <p>Where any application parcel abuts Tollerton Lane, a 5m depth of land abutting Tollerton Lane will be safeguarded by the Highway Authority to enable future highway works to facilitate safe access for the public within the wider SUE. In addition, primary and secondary routes (where they serve as bus routes) through the site should have a minimum carriageway width of 6.2-6.5 metres, with the provision of segregated cycle routes. Tollerton Lane should be severed to prevent rat-running, while maintaining bus/cycle access.</p> <p>The SPD should stipulate that bus stops should be provided within 400m of home. There should also be early provision of turning facilities within the development. Driveway and parking design must avoid conflicts with cycle routes and ensure accessibility. Shared private drives should serve no more than 5 dwellings and not act as through routes. Cycle storage must be provided at a rate to encourage use at</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a high-level framework to enable the delivery of a site with a number of landowners. The SPD states that more detailed design and mitigation matters, together with their delivery are matters for planning applications for the site and the proposed Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The issue of limiting Tollerton Lane (between the site and Tollerton village) and at Bassingfield is referred to above at ref 236.</p> <p>The document refers to adherence with the highways design guide. It is not necessary to repeat such detailed standards within the SPD.</p> <p>It, however, be of benefit that any road serving as a bus route will need to take a similar form to a Primary Street.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Add to paragraph 4.65 the following text:</p> <p><u>'It should be noted that any secondary routes on site that serve as bus routes will have to be designed in a similar manner to a Primary Streets in terms of carriageway widths and the</u></p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>a rate of 1 space per the number of bedrooms in a unit.</p> <p>Early integration into site-wide infrastructure planning required, with the need for a site wide Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review to be undertaken as part of the SPD, or prior to consideration of planning applications.</p>	<u>requirement for segregated footway/cycleways.'</u>
322.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.75 Vehicular Parking	Requests maximum parking standard is established to avoid over provision.	The Borough Council currently does not have its own parking standards which would require production of a new SPD. The County Council as the highways authority has produced guidance regarding the appropriate number of parking spaces per different types of dwellings and different levels of built up area. This guidance is already used across Rushcliffe and it is intended that it will for this site.
323.	Cllr Steve Calvert Resident 126	4.75 Vehicular Parking	Requests travel and parking plans for the schools and questions how it is envisioned children reach the schools.	Travel plans are normally produced as part of full planning applications. The SPD sets out that the secondary school and primary schools will be located close to the main primary movement corridors and accessible by sustainable modes of transport as private and public transport. It is therefore envisioned that walking and cycling will form the primary means for children to reach the schools.
324.	Resident 32 Resident 133 Resident 236	4.75 Vehicular Parking	Suggests the SPD should require on-site parking meets adopted highway standards, traffic orders and design	SPD states that development will be designed to accommodate current parking standards in

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 275		interventions should be put in place to prevent overspill and construction parking should be exclusively on site.	<p>accordance with discussions with the highway authority.</p> <p>The relevant planning consents will require a construction method statement which will need to set out appropriate traffic management measures for construction traffic.</p>
325.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.77 Vehicular parking	Highlights missing parking quantum	<p>The reference to 'a summary relating to residential parking is provided below' was included in error.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Remove erroneous text from paragraph 4.77 and clarify wording.</p>
326.	Notts County Council (Property) Resident 245	4.78 Sustainable Transport Strategy	Suggests active travel commitments are insufficient as there are no delivery timelines or targets for sustainable modes or mode switch	The SPD establishes that primary active travel infrastructure should be established alongside first occupations. Further details as to when will be determined as part of the IDP and as part of the planning application process. Other active travel infrastructure throughout the site will be delivered through individual applications. Travel plans will be required for the site to demonstrate how mode shift is being encouraged.
327.	Resident 123 Resident 148	4.78 Sustainable Transport Strategy	Suggests development of a park and ride should happen in conjunction with the site	The SPD sets out a requirement to consider the need for and feasibility of a park and ride site to help support development. If it is determined that there should be one, a reasonable and proportionate financial

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				contribution will be required towards the delivery of that facility and connections to it.
328.	Resident 123	4.78 Sustainable Transport Strategy	Suggests improvements to public transport need to be accompanied by parking restrictions and bus lanes to foster public transport use.	The SPD outlines that some parking will be provided on street, but this is to be bay parking in line with design wisdom that this will minimise interruption or risk to active travellers. The number of spaces will be provided in line with the guidance prepared by the County Council as highways authority. At present bus lanes are not identified as necessary within the site.
329.	Resident 126 Resident 219	4.78 Sustainable Transport Strategy	Questions viability of a park and ride.	A park and ride facility is proposed independent of the development.
330.	Resident 75	4.78 Sustainable Transport Strategy	Questions the reference to the Copenhagenise design code	The Copenhagenise design code sets a precedent for making urban areas safer and appealing for use of bicycles instead of private vehicles.
331.	Resident 75	4.8 Sustainable Transport Strategy	Concern development of a park and ride could intensify impact on Bassingfield.	The development of a park and ride site would require planning permission, an application for which would require its potential impacts to be assessed.
332.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport	<u>Public Transport</u> The bus service information and bus route maps in the SPD is significantly out of date.	It is accepted that the bus service information and bus route maps need updating within the final SPD, although this information will always be a snapshot in time.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>The SPD should contain stronger Travel Plan requirements (e.g., free bus passes for new residents).</p> <p>The County Council notes that the costs listed under “Bus Infrastructure” are out of date (Appendix 1, Pages 31–32).</p> <p>References to specific figures should be removed, with the SPD instead referring to the Council’s Planning Obligations Guidance or any successor document published by EMCCA. The figure of £150,000 per annum for a full-day double/single deck operation is out of date and should be removed. NCC’s current guidance, as provided in 2023, identifies a bus service contribution of £1,300 per household (indexed to £1,450 at current values) as the appropriate benchmark.</p> <p>The County Council notes that the SPD proposes two ‘Mobility Hubs’ within the site (Section 4.60). Further details will be required on their design, operation and integration with the wider sustainable transport network. NCC is currently seeking advice on best practice design principles and would welcome continued dialogue on this aspect.</p> <p>All references to bus infrastructure (Pages 64–71, 85, 102–104) should align with the NCC and EMCCA Bus Stop</p>	<p>The costs for bus infrastructure contributions referred to have not been included in the SPD. However, these comments are noted in the context of preparing the IDP.</p> <p>Comments in relation to standards are noted. The SPD refers to adherence with the highways design guide.</p> <p>Paras 4.61-4.63 details what each hub will contain. Further details on how each phase of development will connect into the hubs will be a matter for planning applications and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Update Figure 14 with amended map of existing bus routes.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			Infrastructure Standards, as set out in the NCC <i>Highway Design Guide</i> and supporting drawings:	
333.	Resident 218 Resident 290	Transport	Public transport claims made are inaccurate. Residents of Tollerton must walk to Melton Road to access bus services. Cotgrave Lane only has an hourly bus service, with no service on Sundays.	The appraisal of public transport in the document is, as best as possible, an accurate representation of the facilities present in the area., however, routes and frequency of services are subject to reasonably regular change. New bus services will serve the development.
334.	Resident 22	4.86 Sustainability	Concerns standards for carbon reduction, renewable energy use and BNG are difficult to quantify and thus monitor	Carbon reduction is difficult to measure generally because the impact may occur across various jurisdictions and at various rates. The SPD sets out measures known to ensure carbon reduction such as building to a "Future Homes Standard" ensuring that where reduction may be difficult to quantify, they can be guaranteed.
335.	Cllr Steve Calvert Resident 123	4.88 Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change	States need to include opportunities for renewable energy generation	Domestic renewable energy production is supported by the SPD and wider planning policy. The potential for renewable energy production is also highlighted as potential long term stewardship funding.
336.	Resident 123 Resident 175	4.88 Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change	Suggests the SPD should consider recovery of heat from local businesses as sustainable energy solution.	Policies within the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy pertaining to heat networks will also apply to the site's development.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
337.	Resident 190	4.88 Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change	Requests all homes include solar panels capable of generating 28 kWh at peak and provision for electric vehicle charging.	Domestic renewable energy generation and electric vehicle charging are supported by the SPD and wider planning policy. However, the SPD does not prescribe specific technical standards such as minimum solar capacity for individual homes – these are matters building regulations and also, potentially, development plan policy. Instead, it encourages integration of renewable energy solutions and EV charging infrastructure in line with national policy and building regulations. Detailed requirements will be addressed at planning application stage, considering viability and design flexibility.
338.	Resident 284	Sustainability	Concern there is little mention of measures to reduce water usage and that there could be water stresses as an impact of development.	Requirements for reduction in household water consumption are made within the Part 2 Rushcliffe Local Plan
339.	Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council	4.93 Stewardship	To avoid the issues relating to management of the open spaces it is important they are addressed at the outset. It was unclear to us whether this is proposed to be covered by the "Long Term Stewardship." We feel the strategy for maintaining open spaces needs to be made clearer to ensure the issue at Gamston is not repeated.	The SPD includes sufficient detail in respect of stewardship arrangements at this stage in the process and a good basis for more specific details to come forward as part of the planning application process.
340.	Resident 29 Resident 289	4.93 Stewardship	Concern that maintenance cost for open spaces on the development will fall upon residents through service charges.	The SPD sets out that long term stewardship needs to be considered from the outset of the planning process and planning applications are

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			Suggestion that commuted sums allow the developer to pass on cost to residents.	required to be submitted with a draft stewardship strategy which can further be developed and secured through planning conditions and Section 106 agreements. These will set out the broad mechanisms and the terms under which community facilities, or land for these facilities, will be funded, managed, leased and/or transferred to the future operators/custodians. The Stewardship section of the SPD establishes the need for a stewardship business plan to ensure long term viable income streams for the maintenance of any community infrastructure on site. While this may include a reasonable service charge it is recommended that this be supplemented with other funds such as rents from business on site or community venue hire costs.
341.	Resident 133	4.93 Stewardship	Queries who will be financially responsible for maintenance of sports facilities	A stewardship strategy produced as part of the development will outline how these facilities are to be maintained. Funding options outlined include service charges, sale of renewables, charges for sporting activities, etc.
342.	Resident 133 Resident 226	4.93 Stewardship	Queries who stewardship of public assets on site will fall to and whether this will be public information	Different amenities are managed by different bodies and as such there will be a range of actors including Severn Trent, the highways authority, local government etc. Stewardship plans and other relevant available details will be published on the planning application portal as part of a full application.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
343.	Cllr Debbie Mason	Stewardship	Requests clarity on stewardship funding mechanisms, including profit share from on-site renewable energy microgrid; queries why maps show no designated areas for this; expresses expectation for wider green buffers; ask what percentage of the site green space will be.	The SPD outlines potential funding mechanisms for long-term stewardship, including income from renewable energy generation, but does not prescribe exact locations for such infrastructure at this stage. These details will be determined through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and planning applications. The SPD requires substantial green infrastructure, including landscaped buffers and biodiversity enhancements, but the precise width of buffers will be informed by ecological and design considerations. While the SPD does not specify a percentage of green space, it sets clear principles for extensive provision of public open space, green corridors, and habitat areas in line with Local Plan policy and national standards.
344.	Resident 272	Stewardship	Questions what the proposed stewardship scheme should look like and whether this is sitewide or per application	A high quality, comprehensive stewardship strategy for the development is required encompassing a single site-wide strategy rather than separate piecemeal strategies for each individual site that may come forward by sub-developers within the overall site.
345.	Pierrepont Gamston Primary School	5. Delivery Strategy	Requests consideration of the impacts on surrounding schools when establishing education provision on site. New primary school at Edwalton fields caused a drop in pupil numbers where there is existing capacity Suggests schools remain single	The requirements for schools have been informed by advice from the County Council as local education authority.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			form entry until it is established that existing capacity is full.	
346.	Resident 20 Resident 155 Resident 234 Resident 254	5. Delivery Strategy	Concerns schools in the area have not got capacity for new families	The development of a secondary school and two primary schools is to ensure that there is sufficient capacity.
347.	Resident 2 Resident 161 Resident 169 Resident 173 Resident 175 Resident 176 Resident 185 Resident 190 Resident 146	5.0 Delivery Strategy	Concerns over securing contributions	Planning permissions on the site will be subject to Section 106 agreements to secure financial contributions for public amenities such as transport, healthcare, education and affordable housing. Chapter 5 of the SPD establishes that delivery of certain strategic infrastructure particularly transport arrangements will need to happen early in the development. The SPD also outlines the requirements in respect of the structuring of the section 106 agreements in order to secure strategic and site specific infrastructure.
348.	Resident 2 Resident 3 Resident 7 Resident 12 Resident 21 Resident 22 Resident 31 Resident 41 Resident 42 Resident 44 Resident 50 Resident 58	5.0 Delivery Strategy	Concerns over delivery of strategic infrastructure, suggestions that schools, healthcare etc. be secured before development of housing.	Planning permissions on the site will be subject to Section 106 agreements to secure financial contributions for public amenities such as transport, healthcare, education and affordable housing. Chapter 5 of this SPD establishes that delivery of strategic infrastructure particularly transport arrangements will need to happen early in the development. The SPD also outlines the requirements in respect of the structuring of the section 106 agreements in order to secure strategic and site specific infrastructure.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 66 Resident 67 Resident 74 Resident 75 Resident 80 Resident 87 Resident 109 Resident 111 Resident 116 Resident 121 Resident 125 Resident 126 Resident 128 Resident 138 Resident 155 Resident 166 Resident 173 Resident 175 Resident 176 Resident 187 Resident 190 Resident 218 Resident 246 Resident 259 Resident 264 Resident 274 Resident 277 Resident 284 Resident 286			

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Normanton on the Wolds Parish Council			
349.	Cllr Richard Butler Resident 124 Resident 187 Resident 188 Resident 250	5.1 A. On-site infrastructure	Suggests schools are open to provide for families as soon as they move in	The point at which schools open on the site will be informed by both the capacity of surrounding schools and whether the level of occupation is sufficient to sustain a new school.
350.	Vistry Homes Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land	Delivery and infrastructure	There are ongoing discussions with the Council in respect of the framework s.106 agreement, which should be reflected in an update to section 5, prior to adoption of the SPD. There is too much detail within section 5, particularly in relation to the emerging s.106 agreement. Given the purpose of the SPD is to provide a framework to guide development, and the fundamental parts of the s.106 agreements have not yet been agreed, the current SPD drafting is potentially onerous, and in time may be redundant.	<p>It is appropriate for the SPD to be amended to reflect that there are potentially different options for how section 106 agreements are structured depending on circumstances, such as whether there are collaboration agreements and/or equalisation agreements in place between the main developers on site.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Additional and amended text is included within the 'Framework Section 106 Agreement' section of the Delivery Strategy chapter (chapter 5) with respect to the options available for how Section 106 agreements might be structured and relate to each other.</p>
351.	Vistry Homes Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land	Delivery and infrastructure	Concerned that annual review of the infrastructure requirements would create uncertainty. Requests infrastructure requirements are informed exclusively by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and that	It is accepted that an annual review may not be necessary and a review an interim review of within less than one year will be unnecessary). It is therefore appropriate to amend the SPD in this respect.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			flexibility for increases in cost should be outlined in any section 106 agreement	<p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>'Amend the text at paragraph 5.12(e) to include the following text:</p> <p>'Review and indexation: The Strategic Infrastructure <u>set out in the Gamston SUE IDP</u> (including the scope, specification, description and costs of that Strategic Infrastructure):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>may be reviewed by the Council where circumstances indicate it is necessary (but no more than annually (unless circumstances indicate an interim review is necessary) with such revisions being consulted on by the Council as appropriate and then published (though this will not affect agreed Strategic Infrastructure contributions provided development is commenced within a certain period after such Strategic Infrastructure contributions have been agreed or agreed <u>works in kind</u> <u>Works in Kind</u>); and</u> - <u>shall be subject to price indexation between the date of the last review and publication by the Council and the date of payment.'</u>
352.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Infrastructure	<p><u>Other Requirements</u></p> <p>The County Council welcomes the inclusion of library provision within the draft SPD, however the expectation is that the community library should be co-located in a community building provided at a peppercorn rent and managed with</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a high-level framework to enable the delivery of a site with a number of landowners. The SPD sets out that the determination of more detailed mitigation requirements, together with their delivery are matters for planning applications for the site for the proposed Infrastructure</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>volunteers, would welcome such wording within the SPD.</p> <p>New Household Waste Recycling Centre should be a requirement within the employment land allocation, as the current site within West Bridgford is inadequate, and East of Gamston provides the most suitable location for its replacement.</p> <p>It is noted that the list of off-site infrastructure to be provided at Chapter 5 (Strategic Infrastructure) of the draft SPD already lists "other community facilitates as needed including but not limited to, swimming pools and household waste recycling". This is welcomed by NCC; however, it would be preferable for a new household waste recycling centre to be listed as standalone item on the list of infrastructure requirements given the need for extra capacity.</p> <p>Health: The SPD should include a requirement for a Rapid Health Impact Assessment (RHIA).</p>	<p>Delivery Plan and associated S106 agreements.</p> <p>.</p>
353.	Resident 153 Resident 238 Resident 248 Resident 253 Resident 260 Resident 263 Resident 265	Infrastructure	Concerns existing infrastructure is inadequate to assimilate new development and cannot be updated	New neighbourhood centres are proposed as part of the development to ensure existing amenities are not overwhelmed

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
354.	Resident 43 Resident 156 Resident 161 Resident 166 Resident 167 Resident 168 Resident 169 Resident 171 Resident 175 Resident 177 Resident 181 Resident 183 Resident 186 Resident 187 Resident 188 Resident 192 Resident 193 Resident 240 Resident 241	Infrastructure	Concern that infrastructure must cope with additional traffic generated by the development. Assumes 4,000 new homes could equate to around 8,000 cars, as most households now own to two vehicles.	The SPD acknowledges the significant increase in traffic anticipated from the development and sets out a strategy to mitigate this impact. Improvements to the A52, including new junctions and reconfigured layouts, have been identified as essential and will be delivered where necessary early in the development. Traffic calming and management measures within the site and beyond, alongside active travel and public transport enhancements, aim to reduce reliance on private vehicles. Detailed transport modelling is ongoing and mitigation measures will be agreed with National Highways and the Local Highway Authority at the planning application stage.
355.	Tollerton parish Council	Infrastructure	Request public consultation on IDP	The requirements included within IDP will be subject to engagement with relevant stakeholders as necessary.
356.	Tollerton Parish Council	Infrastructure delivery	The approach to infrastructure delivery is unclear. It is unclear the Strategic Infrastructure Plan / Gamston Sustainable Urban Extension Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Gamston SUE IDP) that is referred to as an appendix to the SPD earlier in the document or whether that is a separate document yet to be published	The purpose of the SPD is to provide a high-level framework to enable the delivery of a site with a number of landowners. The SPD sets out that more detailed mitigation matters, together with their delivery are matters for the proposed Infrastructure Delivery Plan and planning applications and their associated S106 agreements.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<p>There are serious concerns about the content and the approach advocated. The content of Section 5 to be vague, non-committal and incomplete.</p> <p>Concern that triggers and parcel responsibilities are yet to be established and that this could lead to piecemeal infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Request triggers are specified</p>	<p>The text included at paragraph 2.12, including reference to the Strategic Infrastructure Plan, has been included in error and should be deleted. Paragraphs 2.14 and 2-15 also needs updating to provide clarity that the completion and publication of the IDP will follow adoption of the SPD.</p> <p>Modification</p> <p>Delete paragraph 2.12 and amend paragraphs 2.14 and 2.15 to clarity that the completion and publication of the IDP will follow adoption of the SPD.</p>
357.	Resident 117	5.1 Strategic Infrastructure	Requests clearer phasing plan/ Gantt chart to show delivery of various components of the scheme	The SPD does establish that strategic infrastructure, particularly junctions and road infrastructure will generally be delivered as part of the initial stages of development with other infrastructure brought forward once demand is consolidated. However, until more detail is established in respect of infrastructure requirements it is not possible to provide more detail in respect of the timing of its delivery. Triggers for delivery of strategic infrastructure will be established through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Section 106 agreements.
358.	Resident 133	5.17 Viability	Concerned water butts will affect viability of the development	Water butts are a minimal cost in the context of a large residential development and will reduce mains water use and potentially lessen the

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				cost of infrastructure required to manage runoff.
359.	Resident 209 Resident 284	5.17 Viability	In the absence of a fully costed plan for healthcare provision, there is no evidence that the developer can be held accountable. The failure to do so would inevitably lead to a significant additional burden on local healthcare services and potential additional costs for the tax payer.	The viability assessment conducted for the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan took development of a healthcare facility into account and still indicated the scheme's viability.
360.	Resident 37 Resident 50 Resident 54 Resident 75 Resident 121 Resident 142 Resident 163 Resident 173 Resident 179 Resident 224 Resident 233 Resident 239 Resident 245 Resident 284	5.17 Viability	Concerned the GNSP shows the provision of 30% affordable housing on the site will likely be unviable and suggests the SPD define specifically the amount of housing that will be required to be affordable on the site.	Viability is sensitive to market and policy changes. The cited viability assessment demonstrated that within the next 5 years, viability would improve likely enabling delivery of a full 30% of homes for the affordable market. This viability testing took the cost of infrastructure to be delivered and other reasonable development costs into account. The policy remains that up to 30% affordable housing will be sought to remain flexible to viability considerations
361.	Resident 46 Resident 77 Resident 121 Resident 126 Resident 249	5.17 Viability	Requests: - Immediate publication of all viability assessments relating to the site	Current viability testing for all GNSP sites is published and available at : https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/zvxhzu3w/gnsp-viability-study-final-report-sep24.pdf

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 262 Resident 274 Resident 277		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear and enforceable triggers within the SPD so that viability is reassessed at key stages - Inclusion of all relevant costs within viability calculations including infrastructure, affordable housing and community amenities 	<p>These assessments consider remediation and infrastructure including affordable housing and community amenities.</p> <p>The SPD establishes that the developers will produce a financial viability appraisal (FVA) at any point they believe the development as agreed has become unviable. This will be assessed by the Council and if it results in any changes to obligations under section 106 etc, there will be a requirement for the developer to produce further FVAs at agreed stages of the development.</p>
362.	Resident 55 Resident 132 Resident 253	5.17 Viability	Queries why viability table is not included as with other similar SPD documents.	<p>There is no reason for this particular SPD to be subject to viability assessment. Viability assessments have been conducted for the Local Plan process and the sub-section within Chapter 5 relating to viability goes into detail in respect of the circumstances further viability testing for the site might be appropriate.</p>
363.	Resident 57	5.17 Viability	Concerned the GNSP Viability Study references a scenario where 4,400 homes are built.	<p>As stated in the study, developers on the site identified the potential to accommodate 4,400 homes. The Council has allocated the site for around 4,000 dwellings as this will allow provision of significant green infrastructure and other community uses on the site. It is appropriate for this scenario to be tested if housing delivery at this level might be a possibility.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
364.	Resident 65 Resident 126 Resident 132 Resident 142 Resident 245	5.17 Viability	Concerns over lack of costings regarding upgrades and access from the A52	<p>The cost of upgrades to the A52 or new site accesses onto the A52, which are directly required as a result of development, will fall upon developers. The Viability Study conducted for the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan analysed the site's viability considering likely general infrastructure requirements for its delivery. Anticipated costs include upgrades to road infrastructure, new schools and healthcare, new green spaces etc. Developers will be required to provide costings if they deem the viability of their development to be threatened, at which point the Council will assess whether a change to any agreements or obligations is appropriate. If any changes to planning permission are made, the developer will be required to produce further viability and costings assessments at agreed stages in the development.</p>
365.	Resident 68	5.17 Viability	<p>Aware that similar planning documents make more significant reference to the cost of remediation and how this will impact development viability. Requests similar consideration is made in the SPD and that permission for development is contingent on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sitewide contamination survey - Remediation strategy made available for review 	<p>At this stage, it is has not been established that site remediation will present an abnormal cost. Given which, there is no for more significant reference to remediation costs within the SPD. The SPD already adequately sets out that due to current uses of the site there is the potential for land contamination to be present across the whole site. Any potential risks to human health and / or the environment must be robustly assessed part of the planning application process, with any suitable mitigation proposed where necessary.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
366.	Cllr Steve Calvert	4.10	<p>Should quote paras for Viability section (currently 5.17 to 5.22). Is there a danger that developers will hold off implementation until conditions are such that they can argue in favour of a reduced percentage of affordable housing?</p>	<p>The viability assessment conducted for the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan indicates the scheme's viability will improve over the coming years. Securing affordable homes in the current economic climate can be difficult but the Council has its own policy and procedures to ensure that delivery is maximised.</p>
367.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Delivery and viability	<p><u>Delivery & Viability</u> The SPD must define strategic infrastructure, triggers, and equalization agreements. NCC considers it essential that the IDP is developed and adopted prior to any planning application being determined, in order that the costs, trigger points and delivery mechanisms are agreed and set out in Framework S106. We have separately provided estimates of costs and triggers for infrastructure, where possible. Upgrading the footway / cycleway on the entire length of Tollerton Lane connecting with Tollerton village is not possible, unless additional land is obtained, or the link is closed to the motorised vehicles other than buses, and the sites southern end.</p>	<p>It is the intention to produce the IDP before any decision on a planning application is made, and the S106 agreements will detail any triggers and delivery mechanisms. This regard the detailed comments of the County Council are noted and will help inform preparation of the IDP.</p> <p>The IDP will be a living document and may be reviewed and updated throughout the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Land required to provide a footway/cycleway south of the site towards Tollerton village is potentially in the control of the developers.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
368.	Pedals Resident 90 Resident 106 Resident 276	5.2 B Off Site Infrastructure	Concern inadequate off-site infrastructure will entrench car reliance for journeys to West Bridgford, Edwalton etc.	The SPD also prioritises active travel and enhanced public transport to reduce reliance on private vehicles, ensuring sustainable movement across the site and beyond. The SPD identifies that contributions will be secured through Section 106 Agreements for off-site infrastructure including for public transport and active travel routes. The SPD establishes a need to support connections to nearby centres in Gamston and West Bridgford as well as to the wider active travel network via the new bridge over the Trent at Lady Bay.
369.	Resident 40	5.2 B Off Site Infrastructure	Objects to the inclusion of a waste recycling centre in the allocation when there is one already at Rugby Road.	The reference within the SPD to waste recycling facilities is appropriate to serve the needs of the development. The County Council has identified that there is capacity issues with respect to the existing facility at Rugby Road but whether a new facility of this nature is provided on this site remains to be determined.
370.	Resident 31 Resident 35 Resident 57 Resident 79 Resident 87 Resident 108 Resident 116 Resident 124 Resident 126 Resident 161 Resident 176	5.2 On site Infrastructure	Concern over the lack of detail as to what services will be present on the site particularly regarding NHS provision. Also concerns around who will pay for this and where it will be	The section on strategic infrastructure sets out the range of facilities which are expected to be required on the site including floorspace and number of parking spaces where possible. This includes a detailed description of the necessary NHS facility required according to BMA and NHS guidance. The SPD establishes that healthcare provision will be delivered within one of the neighbourhood centres. While the list of infrastructure is currently indicative, the SPD sets out that funding for strategic

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 185 Resident 245			infrastructure will be secured through Section 106 Agreements. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared to further specify provision. While the built infrastructure will be paid for through Section 106, health services are funded through the NHS.
371.	Vistry Homes Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land	Infrastructure – noise	Requests reference be changed from 'Acoustic fence' to noise attenuation features at paragraph 5.2, A.) On-site infrastructure – bullet point 3.	<p>While this list is indicative and it is stated it will be superseded by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, it is accepted that noise attenuation may feature other interventions to mitigate noise pollution.</p> <p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Change paragraph 5.2, A.) On-site infrastructure – bullet point 3 to the following text:</p> <p>'Noise attenuation measures, potentially including an <u>Acoustic</u> <u>acoustic</u> fence, along the A52(T) Gamston Lings Bar.'</p>
372.	Canal and River Trust	5.9 Framework Section 106 Agreement	Explicitly refer to towpath upgrades and maintenance as part of developer contributions	The SPD already sets out that links to the Grantham Canal (which bounds the site) must be enhanced to facilitate access to and from a new fitness trail to be provided within the site to encourage outdoor activity and mobility whilst also allowing for the enhancement of wildlife habitats and the screening along the boundary to the site. More specific mitigation requirements will be a matter for the IDP and as part of the planning application process.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				Some works may be delivered in kind by the developer rather than secured through contributions.
373.	Grantham Canal Society	5.9 Framework Section 106 Agreement	Request section 106 agreements gain contribution to the upkeep of the canal's ecological and amenity value	This will be considered further as part of finalising the IDP and Section 106 agreements. Contributions for off-site infrastructure could potentially be used to maintain the canal's ecology although this may be more appropriately done through a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan
374.	Resident 32 Resident 75 Resident 155 Resident 200 Resident 202	5.9 Framework Section 106 Agreement	<p>Lists requirements to minimise inconvenience for existing residents including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site wide construction management plan and site Logistics plan to be approved before works start - Requirement for construction traffic access to be via the A52 only - Working hours restricted to 8:00-18:00 on weekdays and 8:00-13:00 on Saturdays - Monthly monitoring and publishing of dust noise and vibration levels enforceable by the Council 	The relevant planning consents will require a construction method statement which will need to set out appropriate mitigation measures for construction.
375.	Resident 32	5.9 Framework Section 106 Agreement	Suggests SPD should require the Borough Council to produce an annual infrastructure and construction monitoring report funded via Section 106 and use its	The Council does have the option of taking enforcement action, and potentially as part of this suspending construction, if section 106

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			enforcement powers to suspend further occupations if phasing or mitigation conditions are breached	agreements are broken. Construction will be monitored throughout buildout.
376.	Resident 32 Resident 161 Resident 162	5.9 Framework Section 106 Agreement	<p>Lists suggested pre-occupation conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary Junctions serving that phase are complete - Strategic drainage and flood-mitigation works are installed and functioning - Sites for first school, health facility and open space infrastructure are serviced transferred and ready for use. 	Appropriate conditions or obligation will be considered part of any conditions attached to planning consents and/or within associated Section 106 agreements.
377.	Resident 32	5.9 Framework Section 106 Agreement	<p>Lists suggested components of framework Section 106 Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial security mechanisms (bank bond, parent-company guarantee or escrow) covering the full estimated cost of unbuilt infrastructure at each phase - Stage triggers preventing commencement or occupation until funds for relevant infrastructure are secured - Enables the Council to call upon the bond if the developer or land-owner defaults or sells parcels without fulfilling obligations 	Appropriate conditions or obligation will be considered part of any conditions applied to planning consents and/or within associated Section 106 agreements.

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regular reporting on infrastructure expenditure and remaining liabilities. 	
378.	Resident 33 Resident 169 Resident 179 Resident 185 Resident 230 Resident 283	5.9 Framework Section 106 Agreement	<p>Concerns split land ownership leaves opportunity for developers to dispute responsibility for infrastructure delivery. Expresses lack of trust in developers' delivery of infrastructure following closure of the airfield and footpaths being blocked while securing the site.</p>	<p>A main function of the SPD is to establish a framework to ensure that each developer will contribute proportionately to the strategic infrastructure required. As part of this approach, the SPD indicatively identifies these infrastructure requirements and establishes that they will be finalised as part of a subsequent IDP.</p> <p>Each planning application on the site will be subject to a Section 106 agreement to secure financial contributions for public amenities such as transport, healthcare, education and affordable housing. Chapter 5 of this SPD establishes that delivery of certain strategic infrastructure items, particularly transport arrangements, will need to happen early in the development.</p>
379.	Resident 126 Resident 243	5.9 Framework Section 106 agreements	<p>Queries what governing triggers and principles will be used to prompt infrastructure delivery.</p>	<p>Triggers for infrastructure delivery in large developments vary but examples of triggers used include numbers of properties constructed, sold or occupied. In the case of this development, the SPD clearly establishes a principle that development of each phase of development will be contingent on the necessary road infrastructure and active travel</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				improvements, particularly junctions on the A52, having been built.
380.	Resident 262	5.9 Framework Section 106 agreements	Suggests the SPD contains no adequate measures to ensure developers deliver agreed amenities as section 106 agreements are subject to viability and are deviated from.	The Council has taken a proactive approach to ensuring contributions are secured by laying out the required infrastructure both in the Local Plan and in this SPD and setting out that the IDP will establish requirements in more detail in due course. This helps reduces the uncertainty faced by developers and enables them to foresee and rectify any viability issues before development commences. The Council has also adopted a developer contributions SPD to ensure that developers have further certainty of the costs their developments will incur.
381.	Environment Agency	6 Design Codes	Suggest sitewide design code can be more prescriptive regarding water consumption e.g. requirement for all new residential to meet tighter water efficiency measures of 110 litres per person.	This requirement is already made within the Rushcliffe Part 2 Local Plan
382.	Resident 1	6.0 Area Design Instructions	Require compliance with the Borough wide Design Code	There are several factors on the site which necessitate the use of a site-specific design code. Primarily the scale of development and the number of developers who will be simultaneously present on the site requires an overarching design framework to ensure the development comes forward as a cohesive neighbourhood. Notwithstanding this, it is set out that Area Design Codes are prepared and agreed for all parts of the site and that these

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				incorporate relevant design codes and guidance included within the Rushcliffe Design Code SPD (adopted September 2025), unless an alternative approach is demonstrated to be justified.
383.	Resident 23 Resident 87	6.1 Key Character Areas and Design Frontage	Suggests the development has little architectural merit and inspiration should be taken from pioneering developments in the southwest or from local character assessment in the plan.	The detailed design of buildings on the site has not been established through the SPD. It is made clear that there will be three character areas with different architectural influences and a range of building types across these. More detailed design requirements will be established as part of the required preparation of Area Design Codes and through agreed details in planning permissions.
384.	Resident 1	6.2 Woodland View	Supports development of green infrastructure to reinforce the southern boundary. Requests acoustic fencing, minimal street lighting and air quality monitoring to reduce "Urbanising effect"	While the proposed residential development on the southern side of the site is not expected to have a significant impact on noise levels, the provision of a buffer including woodland should help to mitigate any increases in noise. Section 4.2 "Access and Movement" in the SPD establishes how lighting will either be absent or be designed to limit light spill i.e. avoiding light pollution when crossing ecologically sensitive areas including the southern woodland area this will be determined by a Lighting Assessment. Air Quality Management Areas are implemented in areas where national and international air quality objectives are not being

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
				met. The borough no longer has any AQMAs however, one would be implemented if routine monitoring identified air quality below said objectives.
385.	Resident 16 Resident 17 Resident 70 Resident 84 Resident 155 Resident 211 Resident 238 Resident 270	6.3 Gamston Fields	Concerns the development of houses along the Canal will have an objectionable effect on an attractive walking environment	The SPD asserts that enhancements will be made to the Canalside through new features and distinct building character fronting the area.
386.	Resident 206 Resident 234 Resident 254	Design	The proposed housing designs do not reflect the established architectural character or vernacular style of either Gamston or Tollerton. The illustrative materials presented are generic and could correspond to any new housing development nationally. The lack of contextual design consideration undermines the stated objective of achieving a development that is sympathetic to the local area and its distinct character.	The SPD does not propose housing designs but contains examples of how various aspects of design can be implemented to create character.
387.	Resident 274	Design	Concerned images of housing are generic and bear no relation to the character assessment of the area.	The images are used to demonstrate design qualities such as massing, roof lines, landscaping etc. These are not presented as a model for how the development's properties will look

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
388.	Tollerton Parish Council	Design	<p>There are a series of concerns relating to the fundamental quality of the design work that has been prepared, with insufficient specific detail on design itself ad resulting in poor urban design and a poor masterplan.</p> <p>It is unclear why there is no acknowledgment of the Design Code nor an attempt to comply with it within the SPD. There are inconsistencies between elements of the site wide Design Code and the Rushcliffe Design Code</p> <p>There is inconsistency between the Borough Wide design code, the masterplan SPD and the design code on the exact requirements for a primary or top hierarchy street. These all have different measurements for road widths, pavement widths and planting, and all of these are slightly different. Even within the design code itself.</p> <p>Suggests the design code is generic, lacking detail on, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Green space hierarchy - Different areas of character and how these will be distinct - Sustainability - Block form 	<p>The criticisms of the site wide design code are not accepted.</p> <p>It is set out that Area Design Codes are prepared and agreed for all parts of the site and that these incorporate relevant design codes and guidance included within the Rushcliffe Design Code SPD (adopted September 2025), unless an alternative approach is demonstrated to be justified. The site-wide design code provides a framework for more specific Area Design Codes to be produced as the site, which will go into more detailed requirements.</p> <p>The SPD demonstrates how a hierarchy of green space will be created with a central sports hub and the Pillbox Park serving as strategic open space and smaller areas including pocket parks and LEAPs providing more local green spaces. Three different distinct character areas are established. There are various elements of the SPD fostering sustainability. Block forms will vary with density and will be determined at full planning application. The design code does however describe some requirements for land use and block composition.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
389.	Cllr Steve Calvert	Design Code	Queries how the borough wide design code will apply to the new builds	It is set out that Area Design Codes are prepared and agreed for all parts of the site and that these incorporate relevant design codes and guidance included within the Rushcliffe Design Code SPD (adopted September 2025), unless an alternative approach is demonstrated to be justified.
390.	Resident 126	Design Code	Questions why the SPD sets out its own design code rather than making use of one in the Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan. Concern over lack of material treatments detailed.	Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan does not contain a design code. Some details as to the materials to be used in different character areas and on primary frontages appear in the design code. Further details would follow in Area Design Codes for different parts of the site.
391.	Environment Agency	Design Code 2.1 Nature and Open Space	Suggests integration of BNG with SuDS to ensure efficient and maximised delivery of both	The SPD establishes the opportunity for attenuation features to deliver BNG
392.	Tollerton Parish Council Resident 31 Resident 43 Resident 54 Resident 70 Resident 87 Resident 88 Resident 98 Resident 117 Resident 118	Design Code 3.1 Nature and Open Spaces	Suggests it is unclear what green infrastructure is to be delivered on the site and that it is unclear whether this is in line with the 2014 Local Plan. Suggests Woodland planting should happen early on in delivery of the site. Requests the green buffer at the south of the site is at least 200m wide	The Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2014 establishes the need for significant green infrastructure along the northern and southern borders of the site as well as enhancements to the Grantham Canal, all of which are further elaborated in the SPD. There are various habitats planned across the site, notably woodland on the southern boundary and pond and wetland features adjacent to the canal and countryside to the east. The timing of the woodland planting will appropriately be

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 121 Resident 191 Resident 211 Resident 220 Resident 234 Resident 236 Resident 237 Resident 243 Resident 246 Resident 249 Resident 250 Resident 252 Resident 254 Resident 260 Resident 265 Resident 271 Resident 273 Resident 274 Resident 275 Resident 281 Resident 283 Resident 286 Resident 289			<p>determined as part of conditions attached to planning permissions and/or S106 planning obligations.</p> <p>Rather than applying an arbitrary minimum width, the depth of the green buffer will be informed by ecological assessment of the site, the need to provide biodiversity net gain and the need to landscape development</p>
393.	Resident 31 Resident 43 Resident 81 Resident 89 Resident 111 Resident 116 Resident 138 Resident 160	Design Code 4.2 Access and Movement	Suggests there is lack of clarity as to whether public rights of way will be maintained and whether there will be safe active travel routes between Tollerton and Gamston, particularly the Grantham Canal.	Public rights of way throughout the site are required to be maintained and enhanced through its development. The design code establishes a requirement for all primary streets identified (where vehicle volumes exceed 2,000 movements per day and where speeds are greater than 20mph) to include a 3m wide cycleway. It is also established that

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 163 Resident 169 Resident 191 Resident 193 Resident 196 Resident 232 Resident 234 Resident 236 Resident 247 Resident 254 Resident 267 Resident 273 Resident 283 Resident 289			improvements to foot and cycle crossings across the A52 will be made as part of the development.
394.	Resident 43 Resident 155 Resident 193 Resident 196 Resident 281	Design Code 4.2 Access and Movement	Suggests it would be beneficial for residents of Tollerton village were the SPD to establish a safe cycle route through the development to the Grantham Canal	The access and movement strategy establishes that all primary streets will have a segregated cycleway and all leisure routes through the site will have 3m wide shared foot and cycleways creating multiple safe cycle routes between the canal and Tollerton village. It is specified that there is upgraded footway/cycleway provision on the entire length of Tollerton Lane through the site, connecting to Tollerton village.
395.	Resident 33 Resident 150 Resident 164 Resident 230 Resident 236	Design Code 6.1 Key Character Areas and	Suggests character of other Rushcliffe settlements has been degraded by development and there are no clear plans for separation of the development from the villages to the north and south.	The development of the land East of Gamston looks to take pressure off existing settlements such as Keyworth to assimilate such development. The SPD establishes the requirement for significant buffers on the

Ref	Respondents	Section Reference/ Topic	Summary of comments	Proposed Responses
	Resident 272 Resident 275	Distinctive Edge Frontage		periphery of the development to maintain visual and physical separation from the green belt and surrounding villages. This will include new copse and tree planting, attenuation basins and water meadow as well as other habitats.
396.	Canal and River Trust	Design Code 6.3 Gamston Fields	Requests clearer design guidance including avoidance of uniform 'Wharf' style architecture, ensuring variation in scale and massing and prevention of overshadowing and hard edges.	The design guidance specifies occasional changes in materials and roof heights.
397.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Site Wide Design Code	A number of detail comments are made on the contents of the Site Wide Design Code and changes suggested.	The comments have reviewed. Many reflect details within the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide and the SPD refers to adherence with it. Others related to details that have not yet been established and will be agreed at part of the planning application process.
398.	Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council	Site Wide Design Code, paragraph 1	Suggests an additional sentence to say. 'Strong linkage to the existing settlement is a fundamental requirement which should major on safe pedestrian and cycle routes.'	The SPD makes adequate reference to the need for connections to the urban area particularly by active travel.