



Cabinet

Tuesday, 10 March 2026

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

Report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth

Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, Councillor R Upton

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. The purpose of the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is to provide guidance on the application of Policy 25 (Strategic Allocation at East of Gamston/North of Tollerton) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.
- 1.2. A draft SPD was published for consultation on 1 October 2025 and consultation finished on 5 November 2025. The consultation responses have been considered and a number of revisions to the draft SPD are proposed in response to some of the issues raised by consultees.
- 1.3. The revised draft SPD was previously considered by Cabinet on 13 January 2026. It decided to pause the SPD approval process in response to comments made to the public consultation, whilst more detailed information was sought on highways related matters from the relevant site landowners and developers, Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority and National Highways. The responses received from all the various bodies are appended to this report for Cabinet's consideration.
- 1.4. The report recommends that the revised draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework SPD (at Appendix 1) is adopted. Once adopted, it will form a material consideration in the determination of relevant planning applications on the allocated site.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:

- a) considers any recommendations made by the Local Development Framework Group;
- b) supports the proposed revisions to the draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document;
- c) approves the adoption of the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document; and

- d) delegates authority to the Director – Development and Economic Growth, in consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, to make any necessary final graphical, presentational and minor textual changes required to the SPD prior to publication.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

If adopted, the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework SPD will provide guidance on the application of Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy Policy 25 (Strategic Allocation at East of Gamston/North of Tollerton). The SPD's key role is to provide further guidance, a development framework and masterplan for the whole of the strategic allocation to help achieve an appropriate collective and coordinated development outcome for the whole site and ensure that site-wide infrastructure requirements are fully and collectively met by all individual developments on site. Separate to the SPD, delivery of development will be further guided by the inclusion of more specific details in respect of infrastructure requirements (including what, when and by whom) within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that is due to be completed and published in due course and prior to the determination of planning applications.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. The revised draft SPD was considered by Cabinet on 13 January 2026. It decided to pause the SPD approval process in response to comments made to the public consultation, whilst more detailed information was sought on highways related matters (particularly the connectivity of the site to and across the A52), from the relevant site landowners/developers, Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority and National Highways. This more detailed information was requested by the Leader of the Council and responses received from the various bodies are considered further at paragraphs 4.27 to 4.42.

Local Plan proposals and policy

- 4.2. The East of Gamston/North of Tollerton site was allocated and removed from the Green Belt as part of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, which was adopted in December 2014. It was allocated for around 4,000 dwellings, 20 hectares of employment development, a neighbourhood centre and other supporting development and facilities. More recently, it was proposed that the site is carried forward as an allocation in the emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan, which was published in draft in March 2025 and submitted for examination in December 2025.
- 4.3. The site specific policy for the allocation within the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (Policy 25) identifies that it is expected that the design and layout of the proposal will be determined through a masterplanning process, and also that development should be appropriately phased to take into account the provision of necessary infrastructure, including improvements to the highway network along the A52 and public transport network. Policy 25's supporting text also makes clear that the Council expects that from the outset there should be a comprehensive scheme for the site as a whole and for its entire development.

- 4.4. The site-specific policy within the emerging GNSP (draft Policy 31) goes further in terms of details in respect of the Council's expectations as to how development on the site should be realised. Draft Policy 31's supporting text (at paragraph 3.31.7 of the GNSP) states:

“The Council expects that there should be a comprehensive masterplan and development framework for the site as a whole and for its entire development. To meet this requirement, the Council is preparing a site-wide masterplan and development framework for the allocated site which will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) or Supplementary Plan (SP). The document will coordinate and guide individual developments and their relevant planning applications and associated planning obligations across the site. In order to ensure a coordinated and consistent basis to planning obligations for developments of parts of the overall site, it is expected that an overarching common Framework Section 106 approach will be prepared and applied in relation to infrastructure obligations in respect of all applications for development of the site.”

Planning applications and context for the Development Framework/ Masterplan

- 4.5. In the period following the site's allocation in December 2014 there were intermittent discussions involving the Council and the various landowners/ developers in respect of attempts to coordinate and bring about the submission of a single site-wide planning application for a comprehensive development scheme. This, ultimately, did not happen and, aside from development of the Spire Hospital, a limited amount of employment development and the granting of outline planning permission for a residential care home and assisted living dwellings, a site-wide development scheme remains outstanding, and the delivery of the strategic allocation is yet to begin. Continued delays seriously risk increasing pressure to release additional land elsewhere within Rushcliffe for housing and employment development.
- 4.6. In December 2020, Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Homes submitted an outline planning application on part (around 42%) of the allocated site for up to 2,250 homes, a primary school and local centre. In response, the Council raised concerns that development was coming forward in a piecemeal and uncoordinated manner and, consequently, made it be known that it expected more detailed planning guidance including a site-wide masterplan to be put in place to address this situation and before planning applications could be positively determined. The Council began in early 2021 the process of preparing a development framework and masterplan SPD for the site, which it did so in collaboration with the main landowners/developers who were willing to be involved.
- 4.7. In March 2024, Vistry Homes submitted a hybrid (part full and part outline) planning application for around 1,600 homes, a primary school and associated development on the Tollerton airfield part of the site (which is around 40% of the allocated site). Vistry had acquired the airfield in 2023 and subsequently also started working collaboratively with the Council on preparation of the SPD.

- 4.8. The other main landowner on the allocated site is Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) (whose landholding covers around 15% of the allocated site). NCC has to date not submitted a planning application for the land under its control.

Draft Development Framework/Masterplan

- 4.9. In order to effectively deal with separate planning applications coming forward on the site, a Development Framework SPD has been prepared in draft to broadly guide and coordinate each likely development parcel. The aim is to achieve an appropriate collective development outcome for the whole site and ensure site-wide infrastructure requirements are fully and collectively met by all individual developments.
- 4.10. A key role of the SPD is to establish the broad distribution of land uses and transport links on the site and establish a site-wide framework for achieving high quality design outcomes. It is also to broadly establish what supporting infrastructure is required, where it is required and the mechanism for ensuring developers collectively deliver the infrastructure when needed. The SPD will be applied in the determination of all planning applications to ensure that each constituent development scheme contributes to site-wide requirements in full and in an equitable manner.
- 4.11. The SPD would not form part of the Local Plan, nor introduce new planning policy, but would support the allocated site's delivery in accordance with Local Plan policy and be a material consideration in planning application decisions. It would therefore be necessary for developers to take into account its requirements for the broad layout and design of development and to fully contribute to site-wide infrastructure requirements.
- 4.12. In terms of content, the draft SPD (at Appendix 1) includes the following elements:
- A vision for development, taking into account the Local Plan's proposals and policies for the site;
 - A site context and analysis section;
 - A development framework, including the broad configuration of likely land uses across the site;
 - A delivery strategy to identify likely development phases, site-wide infrastructure requirements (where details are established) and the mechanism for ensuring how and when each phase should contribute to these infrastructure requirements; and
 - A site-wide design code (as an appendix to the SPD) to broadly guide the layout and design of development.
- 4.13. The development framework (section 4 of the SPD) provides further guidance and details on a range of matters including:
- Design Objectives;
 - Land Uses;

- Employment;
 - Secondary school and primary schools;
 - Green and Blue Infrastructure;
 - A movement framework;
 - Character;
 - Sustainability;
 - A site-wide framework masterplan; and
 - A stewardship strategy for the management of public amenities on site.
- 4.14. In addition to indicatively identifying strategic (whole site) infrastructure requirements (where details are currently known), the SPD's development strategy section (section 5) sets out that a separate Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will be prepared and published by the Council prior to the approval of planning applications. The IDP will contain finalised details of strategic infrastructure requirements and would supersede the indicative infrastructure list contained within the SPD. The published IDP may need to be reviewed by the Council in the future where circumstances indicate this is necessary. The infrastructure requirements included within the IDP would be secured as planning obligations via section 106 agreements for the development of any land parcel within the allocated site.
- 4.15. Section 5, delivery strategy, sets out that a framework section 106 agreement approach and/or 'linked' section 106 agreements will be utilised to serve as an overarching mechanism for ensuring that required strategic infrastructure is delivered in a coordinated manner and that each development parcel contributes towards this infrastructure on an equitable and proportionate basis. The framework section 106 agreement would form a base template document for individual section 106 agreements.
- 4.16. The Site Wide Design Code provides a set of high-level design instructions and principles, on matters such as character and movement, which would be used to guide development on each separate land plot to achieve a coordinated vision for the whole site. It is expected that it would be used by every developer to provide consistency and quality across the site. The code provides a mechanism for controlling the character, quality and appearance of the development as it evolves over time and sets broad guidelines and parameters for each detailed development scheme. The code provides flexibility for adaptation and adjustment in response to evolving trends, technologies and best practice over the long lifetime of the whole site's development.
- 4.17. It is expected that Area Design Codes would be prepared and agreed for all parts of the site unless an exception is justified. These Area Design Codes would be informed by the high-level instructions and requirements of the Site Wide Design Code. In addition, Area Design Codes should incorporate relevant design codes and guidance included within the Rushcliffe Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (adopted September 2025), unless an alternative approach is demonstrated to be justified.

Consultation on the draft SPD

- 4.18. A draft of the SPD was considered by the Local Development Framework (LDF) Group on 5 September 2025, and the Group supported it being published for consultation. The consultation started on 1 October 2025, and consultation finished on 5 November 2025. In total, 318 representations were submitted by residents, statutory bodies, developers and other stakeholders. A summary of the comments and proposed responses to the issues raised is provided in Appendix 2.
- 4.19. In summary, some of the main issues raised by consultees include:
- That development will increase traffic movements locally and lead to additional congestion and 'rat-running', without it being clear within the SPD what measures will be put in place to lessen such potential impacts;
 - That the finalisation of the SPD needs to wait for the completion of transport assessment work and include more details in respect of highway works and active travel and public transport infrastructure requirements;
 - That more certainty is needed in respect of the infrastructure requirements for supporting development, in terms of what specifically is required and when it needs to be delivered;
 - That pedestrians and cyclists would be better served by the provision of a new bridge between the site and Gamston, rather than all new crossings being at grade;
 - That the design requirements set out in the SPD are not aspirational enough;
 - Concerns that the site will be contaminated and therefore unsuitable for development, that remediation requirements will potentially adversely affect the viability of development and that there should be a full contamination survey now to inform preparation of the SPD;
 - That the site should be allowed to continue as an operational airfield; and
 - That development could increase the likelihood of flooding in areas off site, including locations already susceptible to flooding. This includes areas to the south in the vicinity of Cotgrave Lane and Tollerton Lane, Tollerton.
- 4.20. A number of revisions to the draft SPD are proposed in response to some of the issues raised by consultees, where changes are considered justified. Other modifications are also proposed for reasons of clarity and to correct any errors. These changes are set out in Appendix 2, and the revised draft SPD at Appendix 1 shows all proposed revisions. These are highlighted as track changes – new text appears in blue and underlined, while deleted text is shown in red with strikethrough.
- 4.21. The main proposed revisions to the draft SPD include:
- Additional text to emphasise that a primary route for pedestrians and cyclists between the site and Gamston centre will need to be provided, and that this could be the provision of a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the A52, or it could be at-grade controlled crossings on the A52 between the site and Ambleside. New text is proposed setting out that the 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;

- Additional text at paragraph 3.23 to provide more explanation as to the process for assessing risks from potential land contamination on site;
- A number of revisions to Chapter 5 in order to update and better explain the approach to securing development contributions collectively from all developers towards new and improved infrastructure;
- Revisions to Chapter 5 to better acknowledge the Highway Authority's preference for off-site highways works to be delivered by developers directly;
- Inclusion of text within Chapter 1 to highlight that the Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in February 2025 and forms part of the development plan for the site; and
- Updates to Figures 2 and 7 within the Site Wide Design Code (which is an appendix to the SPD) to show on these two plans the correct position of the proposed gypsy and traveller site.

4.22. With regard to the argument that preparation of the SPD should be delayed, particularly until the outcome of ongoing transport assessment work is known, this would not be a recommended course of action. It is important 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 applications.

4.23. This is, firstly, to avoid missing a 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 a Supplementary Plan (SP), which is a whole new process requiring a public examination of the draft SP, thereby adding months to the preparation process and further delaying the site's vital contribution to the Borough's housing land supply.

4.24. Secondly, avoiding further delay is also important to minimise the very real risk that current planning applications are taken to appeal on the basis of non-determination prior to the SPD being adopted. If this were to happen without an SPD being in place, this would fundamentally prejudice the purpose of the SPD in ensuring that individual development parcels are delivered in a coordinated and complementary manner. The suitability of more detailed transport and highways information being established in the IDP and as part of planning applications, rather than as part of the SPD, is considered further below at paragraphs 4.27 to 4.42.

4.25. In response to those raising concern about potential contamination on site, such matters are not for further consideration within the SPD. These are matters more appropriately dealt with at the planning application process stage and/or by site investigation and remediation conditions attached to a grant of planning permission. Nonetheless, it is considered helpful to add to the text at paragraph 3.23 of the SPD to provide more explanation in respect of the process for assessing risks from potential land contamination.

- 4.26. A note has also been prepared by Pinsent Mason LLP which summarises the SPD's purpose and benefits. Pinsent Masons LLP has been appointed to provide legal advice to the Council in relation to the site and has specifically advised the Council on the preparation of the SPD. This note, which supports the case for adopting the SPD, is set out at Appendix 3.

Further consideration of highways related matters

- 4.27. The letters sent by the Leader of the Council to the relevant site landowners/ developers, Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority and National Highways requesting more details in respect of highways related matters are set out at Appendix 4 and their letters in reply are set out at Appendix 5.
- 4.28. The site landowners/developers were asked for clarity on three areas:
- On there being a comprehensive highways solution for the whole allocation;
 - An update on transport modelling and evidence of active engagement with Highway Authorities; and
 - Details of infrastructure requirements, including confirmation that an A52 bridge and an off-site park and ride are being considered.
- 4.29. A joint response has been received from all the relevant landowners/ developers: Taylor Wimpey, Barwood Land, Vistry Group and Nottinghamshire County Council/Arc Partnership. It is confirmed that there is now a single, aligned highways access strategy for the entire strategic allocation. Amendments are being made to the existing planning applications so that they all propose the same three A52 junctions, thereby providing a comprehensive and coordinated approach across the allocated site. It is identified that any forthcoming application (new or amended) will align with this strategy.
- 4.30. It is also confirmed that they are working jointly and collaboratively with each other, National Highways, NCC as Highway Authority, and the Borough Council to finalise transport modelling. Strategic and more detailed transport modelling has progressed substantially, and a unified evidence base will be used to support all planning applications. This work will be completed in due course and then submitted through the planning application process.
- 4.31. Finally, it is confirmed that potential mitigation measures, including an A52 bridge and park and ride provision, are being actively assessed as part of the transport evidence to establish whether they are necessary and justified to mitigate development impacts. While the IDP (which will be required by the SPD once adopted) cannot be finalised until the transport modelling is complete, the landowners/ developers have submitted with their letter an interim schedule to demonstrate that significant work is underway by them collectively in order to ensure that the allocation will be supported by the necessary infrastructure, delivered at the appropriate time.
- 4.32. NCC as the Highway Authority and National Highways were asked to provide confirmation and reassurance that both are committed to working positively with each other, the developers and the Council to identify a suitable highways

solution for the site. They were also asked to provide an understanding of the resourcing that is being made available to ensure full engagement in the development of a highway's solution and the provision of timely comments to information provided by both the developers and Council.

- 4.33. NCC has confirmed that it is fully engaged with both National Highways and Active Travel England on this matter and that it has sought to fully engage and be as proactive as possible with the Borough Council, and it will continue to prioritise the timely provision of comments and technical feedback to ensure progress is not delayed. NCC highlight that it and National Highways have for some time been calling for a single, fully comprehensive transport assessment covering the whole of the allocation to provide a robust evidence base upon which to determine the infrastructure requirements contained within the SPD.
- 4.34. It is important to note that the Borough Council has also been calling for a single comprehensive transport assessment for several years. Achieving a comprehensive solution has been challenging whilst Nottinghamshire County Council as a key landowner has, until recent months, been a lot less engaged in the masterplan process than other site promoters. NCC own a significant and strategically important part of the allocation and their recent commitment to delivery has now contributed to the single highway's solution being unlocked.
- 4.35. NCC also makes the point that there is a need for high-quality pedestrian and cycle connections over the A52, including consideration of a bridge, to ensure the strategic allocation is both sustainable and well connected. NCC comment that the final wording of the SPD offers significant leeway regarding the delivery of the bridge, making it appear more optional than a clearly defined requirement. NCC therefore has requested that the wording of the document is amended to require a bridge to be provided unless it is demonstrated to be unfeasible.
- 4.36. The response by National Highways, similarly, confirms that it has been actively engaged with the Council, NCC, the developers, and their consultants throughout both the live planning applications and the SPD process, and that it will continue to work collaboratively with all parties to progress the outstanding matters and to identify an appropriate highways solution for the strategic allocation.
- 4.37. National Highways highlights that a holding recommendation remains in place pending the submission of further information, including completion of the outstanding transport modelling which underpins the access strategy. It makes the point that this information is necessary to fully understand the development's impacts and will help inform the progression of the SPD. There are holding recommendations from National Highways in respect of both the live planning applications, which ask the Council not to determine the planning applications pending the submission of such highways related information.
- 4.38. The collaborative and aligned approach between all the main landowners and developers is a significant and positive change in circumstances from the situation previously, when differing and competing highways solutions were

being progressed, different supporting transport evidence was being prepared, and some landowners were not engaging in the process in a meaningful way.

- 4.39. The Borough Council has engaged with NCC Highways and National Highways over many years, convening numerous meetings to achieve a highways consensus and it is therefore welcoming to receive their communication providing commitment to support the identification of a suitable highway's solution for the site. The comments made in respect of the need for the completion of a single, fully comprehensive transport assessment to provide a robust evidence base to support the access strategy and determine the infrastructure requirements are noted and has been the position the Borough Council has been promoting with all parties for many years.
- 4.40. In response, NCC and National Highways should be reassured that there is now a clear, comprehensive, coordinated and deliverable route to resolving the outstanding highways and infrastructure matters, with the landowners/developers working towards a single and aligned highways solution that will be supported by a common evidence base. This joint approach by the landowners/developers should also provide reassurance that more detailed highways matters do not need to be fully resolved prior to adoption of the SPD. There are no statutory or national policy requirements for highways or other transport matters to be addressed in any more detail within the SPD than is already the case. It is entirely appropriate and legitimate, and particularly so now given the joint approach of the landowners/developers, for these details to be finalised through the IDP and planning application processes; supported and guided by the SPD's framework, masterplan and other associated guidance.
- 4.41. Specifically in response to the NCC Highway's letter, Borough Council officers have actively sought their engagement over many years to work collaboratively to seek the best possible highways solution for this site. Where NCC Highways have raised issues and concerns, the Borough Council have followed this up with the offer of face to face and online meetings rather than through an exchange of letters, and the Borough Council has hosted several meetings and calls over a long time period in order to proactively address the issues and seek resolutions at pace.
- 4.42. With respect to NCC's comments in relation to the potential for a bridge, as is referred to above at paragraph 4.21, new text is proposed for inclusion within the SPD to set out that the 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. It is proposed that the SPD states that this could be a bridge crossing. Until this work is completed, however, it is considered inappropriate to prioritise one option above the other. The site promoters have confirmed that the proposed amendments to the current live planning applications will assess a scenario with the A52 bridge and are open to its inclusion, enabling the Council, informed by the Highway Authorities, to determine whether such provision is required.

Sustainability appraisal

- 4.43. The draft SPD is accompanied by a Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment Screening Report, provided at Appendix 6.

LDF Group recommendations

- 4.44. The proposed revisions to the draft SPD were considered most recently by the LDF Group on 25 February 2026. The Group, apart from one abstention, supported the revisions and recommended to Cabinet that the draft SPD be adopted.

5. Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

Cabinet could decide not to adopt the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document. This could leave the Council less able to effectively ensure that all individual planning applications submitted for development of parcels of land on site appropriately contribute to site-wide infrastructure requirements and deliver development in a coordinated and comprehensive manner.

6. Risks and Uncertainties

- 6.1. As a strategic allocation within the 2014 Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Strategic Allocation forms a key component of expected housing and employment land supply in Rushcliffe over coming years. If the site continues to not deliver housing and expected new employment land it would increase pressure for additional land to be released elsewhere in Rushcliffe for housing and employment development.
- 6.2. The SPD will provide a framework for individual development schemes and supporting infrastructure to come forward in a comprehensive and coordinated manner. Without the SPD, there would be a greater risk that development comes forward in a piecemeal and uncoordinated manner which could adversely affect the design quality of the development across the site, the provision of supporting infrastructure in a timely manner and the rate of development delivery. Any adverse effect on delivery could increase pressure for development elsewhere.
- 6.3. The Government views the primary purpose of the planning system as contributing to the achievement of development, including the provision of new homes, new commercial development, and supporting infrastructure in a sustainable manner. The draft SPD will play an important role in achieving sustainable growth locally. Without having the SPD in place there is a potential risk that the Council could lose a degree of control over what development is delivered on site and its quality, particularly if planning applications are taken to appeal and the Council is no longer the decision-maker for those applications.

7. Implications

7.1. Financial Implications

The Council has appointed consultants to support specific technical aspects of the preparation of the SPD and these costs will be recouped through Homes England Grant Funding, and a Planning Performance Agreement with the developers/landowners.

7.2. Legal Implications

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 empowers local planning authorities to prepare local plans and supplementary planning documents (SPD). SPDs are not part of the Local Plan but are capable of being a material consideration in planning application decisions. There is a statutory requirement for public consultation to be undertaken on the draft SPD and for any representations received to be taken into account before it can be adopted by the Cabinet.

7.3. Equalities Implications

There are no direct equalities implications arising from matters covered in this report. Equalities Impact Assessments were undertaken in preparing the Local Plan. The draft SPD would not put in place new policies but would supplement relevant policies from the Local Plan.

7.4. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Implications

There are no direct community safety implications arising from matters covered in this report.

7.5. Biodiversity Net Gain Implications

The draft SPD includes guidance that would help support the delivery of biodiversity net gain alongside new development on site.

8. Link to Corporate Priorities

The Environment	The Government views the primary purpose of the planning system as contributing to the achievement of development, including the provision of new homes, new commercial development, and supporting infrastructure in a sustainable manner. The draft SPD will play an important role in achieving sustainable growth locally.
Quality of Life	The draft SPD establishes a framework which should help ensure that new development respects and, where possible, enhances Rushcliffe's environment.

Efficient Services	The draft SPD includes supplementary guidance that aims to maintain the quality of life for both existing and new Rushcliffe residents.
Sustainable Growth	The draft SPD includes guidance to achieve development that is supported by adequate and timely infrastructure.

9. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:

- a) considers any recommendations made by the Local Development Framework Group;
- b) supports the proposed revisions to the draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document;
- c) approves the adoption of the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document; and
- d) delegates authority to the Director – Development and Economic Growth, in consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, to make any necessary final graphical, presentational and minor textual changes required to the SPD prior to publication.

For more information contact:	Richard Mapletoft Planning Policy Manager 0115 914 8457 rmapletoft@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	<p>The consultation comments made by statutory consultees and other organisations in response to the draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document are available to view at: https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planning-growth/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/</p> <p>Draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document is available to view at: https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/n3thar4l/gamston_tollerton-development-framework-spd_lower.pdf</p> <p>Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, is available to view at: www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/y1pbquqz/local-plan-part-1-rushcliffe-core-strategy.pdf</p> <p>Draft Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan is available to view at: www.gnplan.org.uk/media/dsrndti2/gnsp-publication-draft-march-2025.pdf</p>

<p>List of appendices:</p>	<p>Appendix 1: Revised Draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document</p> <p>Appendix 2: Draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document – summary of consultation responses</p> <p>Appendix 3: East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document: Note on benefits of proposed SPD – February 2026</p> <p>Appendix 4: Letters from Rushcliffe Borough Council Leader to site landowners/promoters, Local Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) and National Highways</p> <p>Appendix 5: Letters from site landowners/promoters, Local Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) and National Highways</p> <p>Appendix 6: Draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework – Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment Screening Opinion Report</p>
-----------------------------------	---