

This matter is being dealt with by:
Stephen Pointer
T 0115
E W [nottinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.pointer@nottinghamshire.gov.uk)



Sent via email to
localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

5 November 2025

Dear Sir / Madam

East of Gamston / North of Tollerton Development Framework SPD

Thank you for consulting Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) on the above document. I am pleased to return the views of NCC. These are limited to aspects for which NCC has responsibility (transport/highways and community infrastructure matters) and have been developed with colleagues responsible for these areas. Matters related to NCC's role as landowner of part of the site will be dealt with separately by our property colleagues.

Purpose and scope of the SPD

1. We welcome publication for consultation of a Development Framework for land east of Gamston / north of Tollerton. Policy 25 of the adopted Rushcliffe Core Strategy applies to this area and indicated that the final design and layout and notably the phasing of development should be outlined through a masterplanning process. The supporting text to the policy outlined that infrastructure required would be funded through a combination of S106 developer contributions. Community Infrastructure Levy and public investment and said that the Borough Council would work in partnership with the Highways Agency and local highway authorities and the developers/landowners to finalise phasing and funding arrangements.
2. The East of Gamston /North of Tollerton site will be the largest urban extension within the Greater Nottingham area and indeed in Nottinghamshire as a whole and as such demands careful planning to produce a high-quality environment itself and with sustainable connections both with West Bridgford and Nottingham City Centre. The A52 Trunk Road creates a barrier at present between the site and Gamston/West Bridgford and requires imaginative and creative thinking to manage transport movements.
3. The site is now re-affirmed by Policy 31 of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP) which was published in March 2025 is shortly to be submitted for examination and will replace the Rushcliffe Core Strategy on adoption. This new policy will form the basis for ongoing development and given its advanced state, the SPD should reflect its provisions.

Transport and Connectivity

Strategic transport and highway issues

4. We continue to note that there is no comprehensive transport assessment covering the allocated site and supporting the proposals in the SPD. This is essential for evaluating multi-modal routes and infrastructure suitability of the internal layout.
5. Any transport assessment covering the site should be informed by an overall transport strategy or vision for the area which reflects National Planning Policy Framework as follows:
 - (development should) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use (NPPF para 117)
 - All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a vision-led transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed and monitored. (NPPF para 118)
6. Critically the Draft SPD does not adequately address the need for safe and improved pedestrian and cycle links between the site and the existing Gamston area beyond the A52 as referenced in GNSP Policy 31 (requirement 10). There is no mention of the potential to provide a pedestrian / cycle bridge across the A52 despite this having been discussed on many occasions during the preparation of the masterplan. The final masterplan should make explicit reference to cycle / pedestrian routes and enhancements external to the site, such as to Gamston, West Bridgford, the future Park & Ride site and towards the City of Nottingham. A wider diagram should be presented to show the alignment of proposed improved routes to be delivered as part of the development. The currently proposed infrastructure will not facilitate such movements.
7. 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. There is no detail of equalisation agreements or how they are intended to work and currently there is no basis outlined for the timing for provision of highway measures, with a lot of measures missing / not determined yet.
8. 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. The SPD refers to the Memorandum of Understanding with National Highways regarding contributions to the A52 but not to other external highway measures. The reference to viability impacting infrastructure requirements refers to pushing back delivery but does not include the option to reduce the quantum of development if funding for delivery of necessary mitigation becomes unviable. This should be addressed especially if comprehensive transport assessment work is not

completed prior to the potential adoption of the SPD. Development should not continue regardless of highway safety matters.

9. 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. Figure references throughout the SPD are incorrect and need revision. The document lacks reference to highway-related standards. Detailed comments compiled through highway development management officers are attached and officers would be happy to advise further.
10. Clearer reference should be made in the emerging SPD to the expectation that the Gamston development will contribute to delivery of the proposed Gamston Park and Ride site given that it will benefit the development by offsetting private vehicle trips on the wider network into Nottingham. The draft SPD downplays this as an “aspirational” proposal. Both NCC and Rushcliffe Borough Council have previously regarded this as a core response to manage traffic growth which is referenced in the adopted Rushcliffe Core Strategy and emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan and is identified as a project for which the Community Infrastructure Levy in Rushcliffe will also be applied.
11. 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. Should such land not be required, this will fall back to the use of the landowners once strategic infrastructure within the SUE has been agreed with the Highway Authority.

Infrastructure and Connectivity

12. In summary our views are that:

- Pedestrian and cycle links between parcels and external destinations (e.g., Gamston, Tollerton, Bassingfield) are insufficiently detailed / addressed.
- Bassingfield and Tollerton villages require early mitigation measures to avoid increased “rat running”
- Crossings over the A52 are inadequate; a pedestrian/cycle bridge is not included. Currently we consider them necessary for safety and connectivity.
- Mobility hubs and e-scooter infrastructure need clearer planning and funding strategies if to be included. Concern is raised regarding promotion of e-scooters, with infrastructure not proposed in the SPD masterplan layout, or guidance given to the parcel developers.
- Gamston Park & Ride is not adequately integrated into the SPD, or connections to the SUE.

Movement and Circulation

13. In summary our views are that

- Primary and secondary streets must meet specific design standards:
 - Minimum carriageway widths (6.2m–6.5m)
 - Segregated cycle routes.
- On-street parking provisions near schools and centres must be incorporated in the scheme layout.

- Tollerton Lane should be severed to prevent through traffic within the site passing through Tollerton village whilst maintaining bus, pedestrian, and cycle access.
- Bus services should be frequent from the outset to encourage sustainable travel habits.

Education facilities

14. Our views are that primary and secondary schools will require:

- Adequate parking and drop-off zones (appreciating demand is likely to be created outside of the school parcel).
- Direct pedestrian and cycle access routes required, considering internal and external
- Wider footways and cycle paths required due to heightened activity.
- Early integration into site-wide infrastructure planning required, with the need for a site wide WCHAR to be undertaken as part of the SPD, or prior to consideration of planning applications.

Drainage and Green Infrastructure

15. Our views are as follows:

- Highway drainage must have positive outfalls; permeable paving is not reliable long-term.
- Equestrian crossings over primary routes need planning and cost consideration – likely needing signal-controlled crossings.
- Green corridors assumption that 30 dwellings per ha is based on parcel red line boundaries, not across the whole site.

Delivery Strategy and S106 Framework

16. Our views are as follows:

- On-site infrastructure needs clearer definitions (e.g., Tollerton Lane works, sustainable transport measures).
- Off-site infrastructure must include upgrades to A606 junctions, clearly state that there are several additional junctions that may require upgrades, along with upgrades / new pedestrian/cycle routes external to the site, all of which currently being determined as part of a Transport Assessment.
- S106 contributions should be in-kind for highway works; funding gaps cannot be covered by NCC
- Triggers for infrastructure delivery must be defined in the SPD where possible, not left to individual planning applications.

Design Code and Residential Areas

17. Comments are as follows:

- Images in the SPD are unclear.
- 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 a rate of 1 space per the number of bedrooms in a unit.

Safety and Accessibility

18. Comments as follows:

- WCHAR assessments are required to determine pedestrian/cycle desire lines and crossing types.
- Bus stop locations must be within 400m of homes.
- Visibility and safety standards for cycle routes and shared space environments must be upheld.

Public Transport

19. The inclusion of public transport considerations within the Draft SPD and the recognition that a site-wide Public Transport Strategy (PTS) will be required to support this large-scale development is welcomed. Given the strategic significance of the East of Gamston / North of Tollerton allocation, it is essential that the SPD accurately reflects the current and future public transport network, including recent and forthcoming service changes.
20. Figure 14 (Section 3.38, Figure 14) should be updated to reflect recent and confirmed changes to the Nottingham City Transport (NCT) bus network as follows:
 - Bus Routes 5 (yellow line) and 7 (green line) – these services no longer operate within the plan area and should be removed.
 - Bus Route 6 – should be added to the plan.
 - Bus Route 11 – replaces Service 33 following the September 2025 network revision and should be included on the plan.
 - Service 822 (blue line) has been withdrawn and should therefore be removed.
21. The statement at paragraph 4.66 (“the site-wide PTS will comprise enhancement of existing bus services (the 33 and 5/7) and a new ten-minute frequency service into Nottingham”) is considered overly prescriptive and does not reflect NCCs current position, nor the submissions made to the Borough Council in respect of planning applications 20/03244/OUT and 24/00347/HYBRID. The SPD should instead refer to the strategic public transport aspirations set out in NCC’s submission dated 29 July 2025.
22. All references to bus infrastructure (Pages 64–71, 85, 102–104) should align with the NCC and EMCCA Bus Stop Infrastructure Standards, as set out in the NCC *Highway Design Guide* and supporting drawings:
23. The reference to bus priority on Tollerton Lane (Section 4.69) should be clarified to confirm the proposal for a Bus Gate, providing restricted access for buses and emergency vehicles only. This would support modal shift and prevent traffic between the site and Tollerton village.
24. The SPD should strengthen the reference to Travel Plans (Section 4.80) by including provision for incentives such as free or discounted bus passes or taster tickets for new residents and employees upon first occupation, to encourage early uptake of

sustainable travel habits.

25. The reference to “bus stops and turning facilities within development parcels as necessary” (Section 5.11 and Section 10 – Infrastructure Table) should be enhanced to state that bus access and turning facilities must be provided at the earliest possible phase of development. The timing of provision should be clearly defined and secured through planning conditions attached to each phase to ensure that public transport services are operational as the site is built out.
26. NCC 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.
27. NCC notes that the costs listed under “Bus Infrastructure” are out of date (Appendix 1, Pages 31–32). 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, noting that such costs are under regular review. The SPD should include a separate line for Bus Service Contributions within the Infrastructure and Contributions Schedule. 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.

Public Health

28. The SPD appears to be guided by the Nottinghamshire Spatial Planning and Health Framework 2025–2030, which incorporates health considerations into the planning system as a strategic element. The SPD seeks to create environments that support prosperity, health, and well-being for residents.
29. The SPD outlines a masterplan that supports:
 - a. Active travel through walking and cycling routes
 - b. Access to green spaces and nature-based infrastructure (e.g., Water Meadows, Woodland View);
 - c. Neighbourhood centres with healthcare, retail, and community services
 - d. Protection of heritage assets and biodiversity net gain
30. The design code promotes compact, walkable neighbourhoods with high-density housing near urban cores and lower density at the edges to preserve village character.

Health Impact Integration

31. A Rapid Health Impact Assessment (RHIA) as referenced in the Nottinghamshire Spatial Planning and Health Framework is required for all major planning proposals to ensure that health considerations are addressed consistently throughout all stages of development. This link and reference should be included in the Gamston and Tollerton Development Framework.

Flood Risk and Drainage Management

32. The Draft SPD provides helpful information on hydrology; however, it should be strengthened to include reference to surface water flooding. The inclusion of surface water mapping would provide a more complete picture of the hydrological processes affecting the site, identifying both the level of risk to the development and the potential impacts on downstream areas.
33. It is noted that Tollerton Lane has a significant and well-documented history of flooding, with Section 19 Flood Investigation Reports published following major flood events in 2019, 2020 and 2025. These incidents resulted in internal property flooding and highlight the vulnerability of this area. The SPD and supporting Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs) must take this high level of existing risk into account and ensure that surface water flows can be safely managed through both existing and proposed drainage infrastructure, particularly in relation to downstream receptors.
34. Future FRAs submitted in support of planning applications should include, as a minimum, the following information and design principles:
- Evidence of a proven outfall from the site in accordance with the drainage hierarchy, considering options in order of preference: infiltration, discharge to watercourse, discharge to surface water sewer, or discharge to combined sewer.
 - Justification for the chosen drainage approach, supported by the results of soakaway testing (BRE 365).
 - Limitation of discharge to the QBar Greenfield run-off rate for the positively drained area of the development.
 - Design of the site drainage system to accommodate rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100-year storm plus 40% allowance for climate change.
 - Demonstration that all exceedance flows can be contained within the site boundary without flooding any properties during a 1 in 100-year plus climate change event.
 - Incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) within the development, giving preference to above-ground systems that deliver multiple benefits including biodiversity, water quality improvements, and public amenity.
35. Details of long-term maintenance and management responsibilities for all drainage features to be confirmed prior to construction.
36. These represent the minimum expectations for site-wide and parcel-specific flood risk management. NCC would welcome early engagement on draft FRAs and drainage strategies to ensure alignment with statutory guidance and best practice in sustainable drainage design.

Education

37. The description of the secondary school and primary schools to be provided within the development (p.49-51) is welcomed by NCC. The delivery of this infrastructure should be highly prioritised.
38. The secondary school site should be regraded, plateaued and serviced (at nil cost to the local authority) as early as possible within the construction programme to facilitate early delivery of the school, given the lack of forecast capacity at existing schools in the locality. It is understood that the site is proposed to be in the north of the allocation, close to the proposed access point, in order to enable early access for construction. A statement should be included within the SPD to establish this principle.
39. It is noted that there are two sites proposed for the primary schools and, whilst these are proposed to be located in the land ownership of two different developers, it will be necessary for the developers to collaborate to ensure that these schools are delivered consecutively, with the first primary school delivered as early as possible (alongside the secondary school), and the second primary school to be delivered only once the first school is completed and occupied. This should be explained in the SPD.
40. NCC will engage further with RBC to agree the mechanism and precise triggers for delivery through the negotiation of the sitewide Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Framework S106 Agt, including the timeframes for providing the land and funding and/or the delivery of the infrastructure, should the developers prefer to directly procure the primary schools within their respective land ownership.
41. The section titled 'Primary and Secondary Education' (p.111) largely repeats the content presented earlier within the document but includes a specific reference to the number of school places to be provided within the secondary schools, based on pupil yield. If this section is retained, the reference to the number of school places should also include the number of sixth form places, as below.

*"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"*
(recommended additions shown in bold).

Archaeology

42. The inclusion of archaeology within the Draft SPD is welcomed. While there is limited data on the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record (HER) directly relating to the site, there are numerous records from the surrounding area demonstrating activity dating from Prehistory through to the Roman period. Consequently, the entire site is considered to have potential to contain archaeological remains. Areas of archaeological interest have already been identified through the partial evaluation work carried out to date.
43. For clarity, it would be beneficial for section 3.51 of the SPD to set out the processes required by archaeological assessment. As a minimum, each planning application for

development parcels within the site should be accompanied by a completed geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation, proportionate to the specific parcel. The results of such evaluations should then inform a robust mitigation strategy, incorporating avoidance where possible and/or appropriate mitigation techniques.

44. 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.
45. 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.
46. The NCC Archaeology team would be happy to discuss these matters further and assist with any revisions to ensure the SPD accurately reflects archaeological requirements and potential across the site.

Built Heritage

47. NCC welcomes the inclusion of a comprehensive section on heritage within the Draft SPD, particularly the identification of the 17 listed pillboxes associated with the former airfield. This provides an important basis for integrating the area's historic environment into the future masterplan.
48. It is recommended that the SPD also recognises the Gamston Canal as a non-designated heritage asset, given its contribution to the local historic landscape and its relationship with the wider site.
49. Sections 3.43 to 3.50 of the SPD demonstrate a positive and comprehensive approach to incorporating the site's airfield heritage into future development proposals. Figure 20 (Site Opportunities Plan) shows a 'green edge' perimeter which, with careful detailing, could provide an effective buffer to both the setting of the canal and the wider rural landscape character.
50. Several of the listed pillboxes fall within this 'green edge' area, which could therefore form an important component in preserving the setting of these designated heritage assets, alongside the 'key open space' to the north where a larger cluster of pillboxes is located.
51. The explicit intention set out in Section 3.60 to protect the "pillboxes, the runways and wider military history" is strongly supported and will be essential to the successful integration of the site's heritage into the future development framework.

Libraries

52. NCC welcomes the inclusion of library provision within the draft SPD. Given the scale of the planned development, NCC proposes to meet the needs of the new community through the provision of an onsite 'Community Library' (Tier 3) as well as expansion of stock and services at existing libraries offsite (Tier 1 and 2), including West Bridgford and Cotgrave Library. This is appropriately reflected at Chapter 5 (Strategic Infrastructure) which lists "*community library and contributions towards the expansion of existing offsite facilities*" (p.81) as an item to be funded by development. NCC would, however, recommend that this bullet point refers to the Community Library being integrated within the Community Hall, for parity with Paragraph 4.40 (p.61). NCC's expectation is that the Community Library would be co-located in a community building provided at a peppercorn rent and managed with volunteers.

Waste Management

53. It should be noted that the closest and most accessible Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) to the development is the West Bridgford HWRC located on Rugby Road. At peak times demand creates queuing traffic, which inhibits the free flow of traffic on Rugby Road. It is not possible to expand the existing HWRC to improve traffic flow due to the unavailability of land bordering the site. The additional demand from the Gamston East development would create increased pressure on this facility and accentuate this issue. In combination with other local plan growth in the borough, existing HWRC capacity will be unable to satisfy any future anticipated demand. or cater for the increased demand in the area. A new site is therefore needed.
54. NCC has conducted a site search in the vicinity of the West Bridgford HWRC, and the Gamston East strategic allocation is its preferred option to accommodate such a development. As such, NCC would recommend that this item is listed as an on-site infrastructure facility and should form part of the land allocated for employment use, noting that this is proposed for a variety of uses of all scales and will benefit from immediate access to the strategic road network. It is anticipated that a site of up to 1ha would be needed to deliver a new facility that meets the needs of the new and existing population, which would represent a small proportion of the employment allocation.
55. 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 facilities 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.
56. NCC would recommend that this facility is mentioned in the relevant parts of the SPD so that the need is understood and the value of land and appropriate contributions can be accounted for within the equalisation process. NCC would deliver the HWRC using proportionate financial contributions from this development and others in the borough, as well as other funding sources which are available to the Council.

Other

57. We note the reference to the site-wide Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and associated Framework S106 Agreement in the SPD. This is supported in principle as a mechanism to develop a comprehensive and equitable infrastructure funding plan for the whole site. Given the formative nature of the 'Delivery Strategy' in the SPD, 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, and look forward to continued engagement with RBC to negotiate the content of the IDP and the Framework S106, to which NCC would expect to be a signatory partner.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Pointer
Team Manager Planning Policy
Nottinghamshire County Council

HIGHWAYS DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

DETAILED COMMENTS ON SPD DOCUMENT

1 Introduction:

- Para 1.2 states that the locations of proposed infrastructure as shown in Fig 41 is a preferred (it is assumed this should actually refer to Fig 44). No Transport Assessment has been prepared or submitted to assess the suitability of the multi modal routes detailed on the Masterplan and their connections with internal parcels and external destinations / interfaces.
- A review of figures references needs to be undertaken throughout the document, as they are not correct.
- Para. 1.8, 6th bullet should be expanded to include “and necessary all mode connections to the applicable parcels with the SUE”. For example, if a parcel is divorced from a primary school, a pedestrian and cycle connection will need to be in place between the two before occupation can begin.
- The National Guidance section does not provide any reference to national highway related guidance.

2 Vision:

- Securing Infrastructure Requirements – define significant planning application term.

3 The Site & Context:

- Para 3.65. The highway would not be stopped up. Although the ability for motor vehicle access bar buses to be restricted, enabling a much better and safer route for pedestrian and cyclists would be our preference. This should be the starting point, with developers being able to vary the position as discussed earlier in the SPD.
- Site Considerations and Opportunities
 - This section does not consider Bassingfield village to the same degree as Tollerton village. Bassingfield village will become a rat run, and as such measures need to be highlighted.
 - There is no discussion regarding connections to external destinations (pedestrian / cycle) to create significant opportunities to for connectivity in accordance with the NPPF. This is one of the most important aspects of the scheme.

4 Development Framework:

- Page 44. East-West ‘Greenway’ reliant on the existing PROW route. There is no controlled pedestrian crossing in this location at present, the significant increase in pedestrian use is not supported, unless approaching facilities to cross the A52 are provided. The SPD must provide more detail to the developers and public of what is expected to be provided, as currently the reader will expect the status quo, which is not Vision led design, and will not cater for the increase in demand.
- Linear Parks: Concern raised regarding 30 dwellings per hectare. The nearby Fairham SUE has good green corridors, but these in effect replace green spaces within residential development parcels, which also ultimately impacts the quantum of development achieved to maintain internal development green frontage etc. the principle is welcomed, however in practice the 30 dwelling per hectare should

simply be based on the red line are of the development parcels, excluding green corridors / linear parks etc. the SPD should at least clarify what the 30 units per hectare actually relates to, as opposed to being across the full site.

- Movement & Circulation: Down grading Tollerton Lane at its interface with Tollerton Village will not discourage rat running, as sat nav for example will direct drivers to the quickest route – which will be through Tollerton Village. The SPD should start with the expectation for a bus gate preventing vehicular access other than buses and enhancing the pedestrian and cycle connection. This will enable the developers to appreciate the starting point. Similar comment should be provided associate with Bassingfield village.
- Car parking associate with the schools should be discussed in the SPD as they need to be incorporated into the scheme and have a bearing on land availability. The standard area for County schools do not accommodate space for the short-term parking demand created which will occur. Therefore, this needs to be designed into the local highway layout, or clever shared use of parking areas. This quite often impacts the ability to achieve housing densities if not considered at an early stage.
- Health & Wellbeing: All possible connections should be defined in the SPD and not be left for negotiation at the planning stage, as there are multiple landowners. This will allow the developers to appreciate the links they need to consider, and quantum of applicable works.
- Why is not direct pedestrian and cycle connection discussed between Gamston and the heart of the SUE? This is paramount for the SUE to effectively integrate with the adjoining conurbation.
- Para 4.25. The secondary school is a 4-form entry, which equates to circa 840 pupils plus staff. This needs to cater for bus access, and sufficient parking provision. The school does not appear to have direct pedestrian links to Gamston, which will be a large draw for walking and cycling trips.
- The document states that a transport assessment will be required, considering traffic impact and parking requirements. The wider site however should assess connections required within SUE to facilitate the school. At its interfaces with the adjoining landform, appreciating demand from Gamston by foot and cycle. This cannot be retrospectively assessed as part of the school application, as the school will not have control of the land needed to make sure the most direct and attractive connections are achieved.
- Regarding the primary school, a TA is welcomed, however in the first instance when the foot and cycle routes are designed into the overall site layout, these should be based on the likely demand created by school and other on and off-site destinations. They cannot be assessed retrospectively as part of a school planning application, as the highway infrastructure may already have been implemented at that stage to the detriment of future users.
- Primary school pick up and drop off parking needs to be considered as part of the wider SUE design, as it creates high levels of parking demand (usually 50% of pupil numbers) when considering wetter and colder seasons. This will mean that roads may need to be widened in their locality to cater for on street parking, the potential for shared use of adjoining facilities parking, or how on street parking and be incorporated into neighbouring residential streets. The sports pitches are likely to require parking so if located near the primary school, they could be used for perpetuity for these purposes, subject to them, for example, being in the stewardship of the sites wide Management Company.

- Green and Blue infrastructure: 4.3.1, 3rd bullet. This refers to pedestrian and cycle connectivity for new and existing residents that connect to the urban edge to nearby Gamston. More detail is needed here to expand upon what would be expected, as opposed to relying on existing links which are not fit for purpose, or necessarily safe given the increase in users that would be generated by the SUE.
- Green and Blue infrastructure: the SPD should state that highway drainage will require positive outfalls.
- Figure 24 – open space strategy. The plan refers to equestrian use of trails. It should be noted that where these cross the primary routes within the site, it is likely that equestrian crossing will be required. This has a cost bearing to be considered – by the developers.
- Connectivity (Page 54): The diagram does not appear to take account of NMU desire lines in areas, such as interfacing with the existing PROW leading to Gamston running across the count land. Surely if the PROW crossing into Gamston is to be relied upon, a direct pedestrian and cycle route should lead directly and unhindered to the heart of the SUE. This may be the intention, but not showing the primary destinations within the site, it does not appear to be the case.
- The Grantham Canal route over the A52 is not inclusive. Alternative routes that interact with the canal either side of the A52 need to be incorporated into the scheme for leisure purposes.
- Drainage: Highway Drainage will expect to have positive outfalls.
- Drainage: Permeable paving cannot be relied upon in the adopted highway as over time it will silt up. Positive outfalls will be required for all highway adoptable infrastructure, and private permeable paved routes falling toward the highway will need to include measures to manage discharge of surface water onto the adopted highway, with the surface water being contained in the private areas.
- Movement Framework: The SPD refers to e-scooters, what infrastructure is proposed to cater for such modes across the wider SUE. This is not discussed anywhere else in the document, as such modes may need their own segregated routes, which has a significant bearing on the highway corridor and land within the SUE and how they interface with adjoining infrastructure. This needs to be appreciated at this stage so the developers know what they need to factor into their designs.
- Para 4.59. We would expect on an initial basis that there would be high frequency bus services between the initial phases of development, to Gamston and West Bridgford, where residential can get onward travel, until the wider infrastructure comes forward at a future point in time. The purpose of this is to change travel behaviour from the outset.
- Movement Framework: Who will be providing the mobility hubs and fund them on an ongoing basis?
- The Primary Hub and Secondary Hub needs more thought, as it's a very high activity areas, with all modes, which increases the likelihood of conflict to the detriment of highway safety. It is welcomed but needs to be located where land is available for suitable connections / routes to be made available to all modes, reducing conflicts, but maintaining desire lines for users. The high-level layout of such a hub should be designed before development of the site.
- Fig 35. Tollerton Lane should be severed at its middle to prevent through movements.

- Fig 35. Access and Movement Strategy. Noting the size of the site, the street hierarchy needs to be considered in more detail. The loop road through the site in effect is a Main Street as defined in Table 3.1.1 of our Highway Design guide. Owing to the amount of development and that it is a bus route, the Secondary vehicular movement route is also a Main Street. This point is further discussed later in this review.
- Primary Streets: Where they are located adjacent to schools and Neighbourhood Centres, the road will require widening to cater for on street parking (minimum 2.5m) and footways widened to cater for an increase in pedestrian demand.
- Primary Streets: have a function providing arterial access through a development, primarily for the main conveyance of traffic within the development including commercial areas. They are the routes all vehicular traffic will use to enter and exit the SUE. They will have 30mph speed limits as they will serve bus routes, unless being located within school safety zones for example.
- Primary Streets. If rear parking is proposed, with houses fronting cycle routes, on street parking likely to need to be incorporated into the highway layout, where demand will be created, but also segregated from the dual use facilities, so that the infrastructure does not attract parking itself.
- **Secondary Streets:** The secondary streets as shown on the snapshot on page 41 (Figure 40) will act as a Primary Street, being a bus route, and serving the level of development proposed. **It will not be supported as a shared surface.** It will need to take a similar form to that of the Primary Street, with minimum carriageway widths of 6.2m, widened out to take account of on street parking in higher areas of activity, such as schools, POS areas, Neighbourhood Centres, or where frontage development is proposed with rear parking courts / locations where they are bus routes. Cycle routes on these roads will need to be segregated from the road carriageway. It is suggested that the movements plan is changed for all bus routes to become primary streets, and then others as shown as secondary, retained as intended, subject to justification that the level of cycle movements on those streets allow for cyclists to use the road carriageway. Where the secondary streets are likely to be desire lines to and from the schools etc., segregated off carriageway facilities must be provided.
- Secondary Streets: Minimum on street parking (informal) will need to be 2.5m wide.
- Secondary Streets: shared space environments with pedestrians are not permitted in these areas, they will be allowed in tertiary streets, where access to development is limited, or on the periphery of parcel development.
- Public Transport: no reference is made to the Gamston Park and Ride. This is a key piece of highway infrastructure proposed sitting on the doorstep of the site. It is imperative that suitable connections are provided toward the proposed facility.
- Active Travel: Para 4.67 says a number of crossing facilities to enable residents to access Gamston Local Centre will be incorporated. **The viability of safe and suitable provision has not been demonstrated as part of the SPD.** This is imperative at this stage as it has a bearing on the accessibility of the site and is fundamental in planning for journeys by foot and cycle.
- Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy, Para 4.69: indicates that Tollerton Lane will be served to motor vehicles other than buses between the SUE and Tollerton Village – is this proposed? although the timing of this is to be determined later. If intended this approach should be implemented before development.

- Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy, Para 4.71: This substantially waters down the likely highway improvements needed to offset the impacts of the proposed development on NCCs highway network. Impacts on the NCC network, irrespective of the MOU items, need to be discussed under a separate paragraph so they do not get overlooked by developers.
- Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy, Para 4.71: It is not clear whether the MOU finding mechanism will receive sufficient monies for all the junction's mitigation schemes to be implemented. Irrespective of the MOU, if the SUE is found to negatively impact the A606 junctions, then it will need to implement mitigation at those junctions.
- Vehicular Movement and Access Strategy, Para 4.72: This will fundamentally not work, as sat nav will direct drivers to use the route, along with driver knowledge.
- Vehicular Parking, para 4.75: should refer to the Local Highway Authority's parking standards.
- Vehicular Parking, para. 4.76: parking on street cannot be allocated and should be designed to cater for incidental parking.
- Sustainable Transport, para 4.80, bullet 5: The ability and route for an attractive pedestrian / cycle connection to the park and ride should be determined to support the SD for viability purposes, as the wider scheme needs to ensure direct connects are incorporated between the two which forms part of the sites blue print, as opposed to being retrospectively squeezed into the site layout, affecting the attractiveness to future users.
- Sustainable Transport, para 4.80, bullets 6 and 7: The park and ride facility is referred to in RBC's local plan, so it is their facility as much as NCC. The joint aspiration should be referred to.
- Sustainable Transport, para 4.80, bullet 10: PROW crossings on the A52 to be upgraded to ensure safe and suitable facilities are available for the intended level of vulnerable road users.
- Sustainable Transport, para 4.80, bullet 22: the site will require an overarching Framework Travel Plan forming the fundamental requirements of the site and monitoring strategy. Then parcel developments will be required to implement detailed travel plans in accordance with the Framework.
- Sustainable Transport: no discussion regarding bridge over the A52 to maximise Vision and connections to existing built environment.
- Character: Design Code discussed under a separate section.

5 Delivery Strategy

- On-site infrastructure, 1st bullet: What are the Tollerton Lane works?
- On-site infrastructure, 2nd bullet: Can this be clarified, is it all primary roads proposed within the site?
- On-site infrastructure, 6th bullet: This should include a carpark, with a TA to be prepared to determine the size required.
- On-site infrastructure, 17th bullet: Can Sustainable Transport Measures (internal infrastructure) be defined as a list. It's not clear what this is or what it relates to.
- On-site infrastructure, 19th bullet 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.

- On-site infrastructure, 20th bullet: Can “Improvements to walking, cycling and public transport links through the site” be clarified, possibly list what the improvement are envisaged.
- On-site infrastructure General comment – appropriate parking determined through Transport Assessment for all land uses, such as GP’s, Sports hall etc.
- **On-site infrastructure General comment: FP6 should be upgraded to be the main NMU link between the centre of the SUE and Gamston**
- On-site infrastructure General comment: PF13 and FP15 will require enhanced crossing facilities on the A52.
- Off-site infrastructure: Pedestrian and cycle connections and improvements to existing infrastructure to cater for the increased demand created by the proposed development to be determined as part of the Transport Assessment(s).
- Off-site infrastructure: Improvements to the A606 junctions should direct impacts be identified as part of the local area impacts of the SUE. Double counting will be off set between what is required to address the local impacts of the SUE, and Strategic contributions part of the MOU. If required due to local impacts, the developer will be required to implement the works through S278 Agreement(s).
- Off-site infrastructure: See earlier comments on P&R facility.
- Access and Active Travel Infrastructure: The road connection between Tollerton Village and the SUE should be severed from the outset, providing significantly improved cycle and pedestrian connections, whilst maintain bus access.
- Access and Active Travel Infrastructure para 5.6: The initial access junction (Tollerton Lane) with the A52 will need to be delivered at least before first occupation of the site, noting its accident record.
- Access and Active Travel Infrastructure para 5.7: This is noted, but it reads as if the parcel developers only need to build up to their boundary, then when the adjoining parcel comes forward, it will be that developer’s responsibility to continue the route. This then becomes a matter of timing, as triggers will need to be set to prevent occupations, until walking / cycling infrastructure is in place. This should be discussed in this section – noted re the intended framework S106
- **Framework S106 Agreement Figure 46: Item 3** new access junctions via Tollerton Lane into development parcels. Limited level of development until adequate infrastructure is installed on Tollerton Lane to facilitate access for pedestrians and cyclists segregated from the road carriageway, along with traffic calming measures to the acceptance of the Local highway Authority.
- **Framework S106 Agreement Figure 46: Item 4 & 5** at grade-controlled crossings over A52 and shared provision. This is not adequate to serve the development site, safe direct connections interfacing with existing infrastructure on the western side of the A52 have not been demonstrated for onward journeys. Why is a pedestrian / cycle bridge not required to support safe, attractive and direct connections for vulnerable road users? This should be a requirement from outset and be provided early in the development.
- **Framework S106 Agreement Figure 46: Item 7.** This is not viable unless the link is restricted to pedestrian, cycle and buses. This is required by the LHA and should be provided as part of the early delivery programme.
- **Framework S106 Agreement Figure 46: Item 8.** Appears reasonable, but subject to other pedestrian / cycle connections to external conurbations toward the city.

- **Framework S106 Agreement Figure 46: Items 9 and 10.** We would expect an interim flyer service to be provided for all development parcels between eh parcels and Gamston / West Bridgford with high frequencies from the outset of occupation.
- **Framework S106 Agreement Figure 46: Item 12.** This is a strategic contribution, the three junctions on the A606 may need to be provided Solely to facilitate the Gamston SUE determined as an outcome of the local transport impact assessments. If this is the case, contribution through the MOU would be obsolete toward those junctions. This needs to be incorporated into the SPD. Delivery time scales will be dependent upon the outcome of the modelling exercise still underway.
- **Framework S106 Agreement Figure 46: Item 13.** It is not clear what this item is actually mean to cover. If this relates to the restriction of motor vehicle traffic between the SUE and Tollerton village, then this should be implemented before occupation.
- **Framework S106 Agreement, General:**
 - It has still not been determined whether several off-site junctions, pedestrian routes and or cycle routes needs upgrading or improving to facilitate safe access to the site. This will be determined as part of the outcome of the Transport Assessments previously commented upon. This must be stated in the SPD with the infrastructure necessary to support the SUE agreed upon before any planning application being granted as it is a viability matter.
 - measures to prevent rat running through Bassingfield village to be developed and implemented with an early delivery to be included.
 - Pedestrian and cycle facilities and connections between each development parcel must be made available before occupation providing off road carriageway connections to Gamston before occupation of the respective parcel.
- **Framework S106 Agreement (a) – Payment strategic Infrastructure Contributions.** It is not clear what this relates to. The highway authority would expect all highway infrastructure (junction upgrades, new / improved pedestrian / cycle routes, crossings, roads etc to be provided in kind by the applicants through S38 or S278 Agreements. Should a funding gap arise, NCC would not have the ability to fund such gaps. It is therefore assumed that this only relates to the MOU when considering highways matters?? Can clarification be provided as this is not clear?
- **Framework S106 Agreement (b) – Works in kind.** It is agreed that these can be determined as part of planning application, but primary highway infrastructure will need to be determined to support the SPD, and not as part of separate landowner planning applications.
- **Framework S106 Agreement (c) – Provision of land.** Noted.
- **Framework S106 Agreement (e) – Review and Indexation.** Noted – this is why we require strategic infrastructure to be funder in kind, as we do not have funding to bridge any gaps.
- **Framework S106 Agreement (f) – Conditions.** Agreed, but some of these triggers will need to be detailed in the SPD, and not be determined by planning applications. The SPD needs to be more explicit regarding what falls under the category of strategic infrastructure.
- **Framework S106 Agreement (g) – Access Provision.** NCC as Local Highway Authority will not be seeking contributions to enable them to implement works. All highway works should be delivered in kind.

- **Framework S106 Agreement (h) – Statutory agreements.** This will generally be the case relating to the NCC as Highway Authority.
- **Framework S106 Agreement para. 5.14.** It is assumed that if the SUE has a direct impact necessitating infrastructure included on CIL list, then irrelevant contributions under that levy, they may need to contribute toward, or provided such infrastructure as without it, the ability for the SUE to be fully built out may be unviable.
- **Viability, paragraphs 5.20 and 5.21.** the Council should also reduce the level of development, if the implementation of the full development becomes financially unviable. This outcome should be included in the SPD, or certain infrastructure be ringfenced so that it cannot be removed. Imperative infrastructure that falls under this category should be listed in the SPD, with the caveat unless other infrastructure providing the same level of service / mitigation is agreed.

Site Wide Design Code

General comment:

- Images in the document are unclear and difficult to interpret.
- It's still very unclear what is proposed on Tollerton Lane. It's not intended to be a primary route, so is it being severed to vehicular traffic (potentially other than buses) within the centre of the site?
- The pedestrian cycle link across the A52 interfacing directly with Ambleside is unsafe. This is a significant issue not being addressed. These needs addressing as part of the SPD as the access proposals at this location do not appear safe until it has been resolved.

Access and Movement Strategy Plan:

- Clarification of what is happening to Tollerton Lane is required.
- Operations of bus gate need to be clarified as it is unclear.
- The plan needs expanding to illustrate the connections intended to external destinations (WB Nottingham city, future P&R etc. The primary desire line externally shown in across the A52 in an unsafe location, or at the Canal where it requires pedestrians to cross at grade.
- The plan should show the primary internal destinations, and primary routes out of the site, and where they lead to. That then illustrates the purpose of the connections.

Access and Movement:

- 4.6 carriageway widths on bus routes must be a minimum of 6.2m, increasing to 6.5 in high activity areas such as school / local centre. Aith increases widening for on street parking where demand is likely to occur by 2.5m to either side if applicable, and 2.75m if loading is likely to occur.
- Bus stop locations to be within 400m walking catchment to homes.
- An in indicative bus stop plan must be agreed to before determining the firsts application. This would simply show the expected location of bus stops, subject to more detailed information being provided. This should be a requirement before determination of any planning application but ideally be included in the SPD.
- Mandatory Requirements:
 - Vehicular accesses shall be minimised where they emerge / cross a cycle route to access a primary route.
 - Private house driveways should not emerge across cycle routes onto the Primary or Secondary routes.
 - Cycle routes must have a minimum 1m deep highway verge to the rear of them, to afford adequate visibility for pedestrians emerging onto them for highway safety purposes.
 - A WHCAR assessment must be undertaken as part of any application to determine non-motorised user desire lines to inform the location and type of pedestrian / cycle crossings.
 - Any adoptable footways must have a minimum width of 2m. Any adoptable cycleway must have a minimum width of 3m, or increased dependent upon the **volume of users and interaction between other users**.

4.7 Primary Streets:

- See previous comments in main SPD.
- Junctions on primary streets will be designed for safety and capacity purposes. In this instance priority will mainly be toward vehicles – the purpose of the primary street is a function to convey a large volume of traffic, and keep vulnerable road users safe.
- “In accordance with the NCC Highway Design Guide, the carriageway width of 6.5m will be encouraged where it passes schools, shops and other areas of increased activity” this is only required where on street parking is likely to occur due to driver behaviour. Ideally, alternative provision would be made, along with measures to mitigate such parking occurring, but good design principles, in the appreciation of human behaviour.
- Cycle routes must be designed to control cycle route speeds to an appropriate speed environment, especially where they have conflict points with more vulnerable road users.

5.2 Residential Areas, Mandatory requirements:

- All apartment blocks and tertiary routes should not access directly onto a primary route.
- Incidental parking for visitors must be designed / accounted for in any design layout, equally disbursed across the site appreciating human nature, at a rate of 1 space per 3 dwellings.
- Parking cannot be allocated on an adoptable street to specific plots.
- Any perpendicular parking spaces must be located outside of the adopted highway.
- Shared private drives must not serve more than 5 dwellings
- Shared private drives must not be through routes to vehicles.
- To promote occupiers to use bicycles secure sheltered parking should be provided at a rate of 1 space per number of bedrooms in a dwelling, at no detriment to garden or garage sizes. Where garages are to be used, these should be oversized to accommodate such parking provision, whilst enabling both cars and cycles to be accessible.
- All dwelling car parking spaces must be within 15m walking distance from front doors, with unimpeded access to the spaces, unless otherwise agreed.
- All corner turner plots must have parking to the side of the property, not to the rear of gardens.

5.3 Mixed Use Areas

- Shared space areas with high levels of activity, will not be adoptable by the highway Authority.
- Planting in shared space environment must not impact general public safety, by means of obstructing visibility of hazards, such as cars / cycle emerging unawares to vulnerable road users.

5.5 Primary and Secondary Education

- See previous comments.
- Primary schools are likely to attract in the order of 50% of pupil numbers (including nursery pupils) being driven to school. Various solutions to take account of significant levels of parking adjacent to schools occurring during start and end of school days needs to be accounted for in the design of these areas around the sites.

- Primary schools create a significant level of walking and cycling trips, with pupils being walked to school with parents/ guardians. In such high activity areas, footways / cycle routes require widening to accommodate the additional demand, and storage of such users when waiting outside of school when gates may not be open.
- Secondary schools attract a high level of walking and cycling movements associated with pupils. This will be created by persons both living in the SUE and externally. All desire line routes for pedestrian and cyclists will need to be enhanced where increased user activity is forecast, identified as part of a WCHAR assessment. This will especially be important when the strategic access arrangements to the site are determined, and connections across third party land within the site.

6.2 Woodland View

- “Key building at end of view. Use of white render as a common material alongside red/orange brick.” In such instances layouts quite often use terrace housing forms that lead to on street parking across the mouth of a junction, affecting the ability for vehicles to turn through the junction, or leading to larger vehicles mounting footways. If only semi-detached focal houses were permitted, this would still allow driveways to be sited to the side of each dwelling, whilst maintaining the visual aspired, and reducing the likelihood of on street parking occurring.

Gamston Fields primary street frontage

- “Dwellings are to be accessed via Streets from the back, via side streets or via access lanes located in front of the dwellings. Building height should be emphasised to respond to the road wide corridor.” This will lead to on street parking, and as such the highway in this location will need to be designed to accommodate this, potentially by widening of 2.5m, or alternative measures put in place.