



# **Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document**

## **Consultation Statement**

**December 2025**

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This consultation statement for the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.2 The purpose of the SPD is to provide information about the provision of and/or contributions towards infrastructure. The SPD identifies cases where infrastructure provision (including contributions) will be sought and secured through planning conditions, planning obligations or Section 278 highway agreements. It will form a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
- 1.3 This statement provides a summary of who was consulted during the preparation of the SPD, the main issues arising from those consulted and how those issues have been addressed.

## **2. Statement of Community Involvement**

- 2.1 The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was updated in March 2019. It outlines how the Council will consult and involve people in the preparation of Local Plans and other planning documents, such as SPDs. Consultation on the SPD is being carried out in line with the principles set out in the SCI.

## **3. Preparing the draft Development Contributions SPD**

- 3.1 In preparing the draft Developer Contributions SPD, a range of internal officers within Rushcliffe Borough Council carried out an informal consultation. Once sections of the SPD were drafted, these were shared with relevant specialist officers within the Council for comment, with relevant changes then incorporated into the document.
- 3.2 A number of changes were also made to the document following consideration of an earlier draft of the SPD by a councillor working group. These changes mostly related to providing clarification, for example adding text on what status the SPD would have once the emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan is adopted and also including more detail in respect of developer contributions to support emergency service provision.

## **4. Publication of the draft Development Contributions SPD**

- 4.1 A draft of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was made available for consultation on between Wednesday 13 August 2025 and ending at 5pm Wednesday 24 September 2025.
- 4.2 In accordance with Regulations 12, 13, 35 and 36 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the draft of the Developer Contributions SPD and supporting documents were made available for inspection during the consultation period at the following locations:

On the Council's website at: [www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planning-growth/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planning-growth/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents)

- As hard copies at:  
Rushcliffe Customer Contact Point  
West Bridgford Library  
Bridgford Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham  
NG2 6AT  
(during normal opening hours)

4.3 The Borough invited comments during the consultation period through the following methods:

- By email to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)
- By post to:  
Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham  
NG2 7YG

## **5. Modifications to the Supplementary Planning Document**

- 5.1 In response to the main issues raised by consultees during this consultation, a number of modifications have been made to the final version of the SPD where considered appropriate.
- 5.2 A full list of bodies notified of the consultation and those that responded can be found in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively. A detailed summary of consultation comments, responses to those comments and resulting modifications is provided in Table 3.
- 5.3 The modifications to the draft SPD include:
- Clarifying legal and procedural requirements by refining text in Section 2 and Appendix 1;
  - Explicitly stating that Nottinghamshire County Council will recharge developers for reasonable legal costs and may apply monitoring fees for planning obligations;
  - Adding detailed guidance on the provision of public transport services to ensure this is addressed more prominently;
  - Additional text to help ensure Parish/Town Councils are better able to influence the design and specification of recreational open space that they may adopt;

- Explaining circumstances where secondary school funding will be secured through planning obligations rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL); and
- Including additional text on developer contributions towards improving library stock.

## 6. Data Protection

- 6.1 In undertaking public consultation, the Council acted in accordance with the requirements of the general data protection regulations (GDPR). You can view how the Council uses, manages and stores data by accessing and reading the Council's Privacy Notice, available via the following link:  
<http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy-notice-and-policy/>

**Table 1: List of bodies notified of consultation on draft Developer Contributions SPD**

Active Notts	Barton Willmore
Active Travel England	Barwood Development Securities Limited
Aerodynamics Dry Leasing Ltd	Barwood Homes
Aitchison Raffety Ltd	Barwood Land
Aldergate Properties Ltd	Bassetlaw District Council
Alexandra Blue Ltd	Bellway Homes
Alverton & Kilvington Parish Meeting	Bidwells
Alverton and Kilvington Parish Council	Bingham Town Council
Amber Valley Borough Council	Bleasby Parish Council
Andrew Granger & Co	Bloor Homes
Andrew Hiorns Town Planning Limited	BNP Paribas Real Estate
Angelorange Ltd	Bottesford Parish Council
Arc Partnership	Boyer Planning
Arcstone Ltd	Bradair Aviation Consultancy Ltd
Arquiva	Bradmore Parish Council
Ashfield District Council	Braemore Group
Aslockton Parish Council	British Gas
Aspbury Planning Ltd	British Gypsum
Astill Planning Consultants Ltd	British Horse Society
Avison Young	Broughton and Dalby Parish Council
AXIS	Broxtowe Borough Council
Barkestone, Plungar and Redmile Parish Council	BT Openreach
Barratt David Wilson Homes	Bulcote Parish Council
Barratt David Wilson Homes and Averill Land Limited	Bunny Parish Council
Barratt Homes	Burton Joyce Parish Council
Barratt Redrow	Burton on the Wolds, Cotes and Prestwold Parish Council
Barton in Fabis Parish Council	Cadent Gas
Camelot Pictures Ltd	Defence Infrastructure Organisation

Cameron Homes	Define Planning and Design Ltd
Canal & River Trust	Derby City Council
Car Colston Parish Meeting	Derbyshire County Council
CarneySweeney	DevPlan
Carter Jonas	DIO Operations
Caythorpe Parish Council	DLP Planning Ltd
CBP Architects	DLUHC
Cerda Planning	DPP UK Ltd
Ceylon Tea Growers Association Limited	Duchy of Cornwall
CFS Flight Training Ltd	East Bridgford Parish Council
Change.org	East Bridgford St Peter's CofE Academy
Charnwood Borough Council	East Leake Academy
Charter Point	East Leake Parish Council
Chave Planning	East Midlands Ambulance Service
Chris Wade Aviation Ltd	East Midlands Building Consultancy
Churchill Living and McCarthy Stone Retirement Lifestyles	East Midlands Combined County Authority
Civil Aviation Authority	East Midlands Freeport Ltd.
Clark Architectural Services	East Midlands Railway
Clawson, Hose and Harby Parish Council	Edwalton Municipal Golf and Social Club
Clipston Parish Meeting	EE
Colston Bassett Parish Council	Elston Parish Council
Colwick Parish Council	Elton-on-the-Hill Parish Meeting
Compass North Aviation	Emery Planning
Copperfield Ltd	Endurance Estates
Cora Homes Ltd	Environment Agency
Costock Parish Council	Erewash Borough Council
Cotgrave Town Council	Evolve Planning & Design
Country Land and Business Association	FH Farms Ltd
Countryside Properties	Fisher German LLP
CPRE	Flawborough Parish Meeting
Creagh Concrete	Flintham Parish Council
Crofts Development Ltd	Forestry Commission
Cropwell Bishop Parish Council	Frazer Halls Associates
Cropwell Bishop Primary School	Freeths LLP
Cropwell Butler Parish Council	Friends of Sharphill Wood
Crown Estate	G Longley Planning & Property Services
Crown Estates Commissioners	Garden History Society
CT Planning	Gascoines Group Limited
Cushman & Wakefield	Gedling & Sherwood CC
DAQS Ltd	Gedling Borough Council
David Lock Associates	General Aviation Awareness Council
David Wilson Home East Midlands	Girlguiding Nottinghamshire
Davidsons Developments Ltd	Gladman Developments Ltd
Deeley Homes	Gleeson Homes
Gotham Parish Council	Jigsaw Planning Limited

Grace Machin Planning & Property	JMS Planning & Development
Granby cum Sutton Parish Council	John A Wells Limited
Grantham Canal Society	John Church Planning Consultancy Ltd
Green 4 Planning	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd
Gunthorpe Parish Council	Kase Aero Ltd
GVA	Kegworth Parish Council
Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments	Keyworth Conservation Area Advisory Group
Hallam Land Management Limited	Keyworth Labour Group
Harris Lamb Limited	Keyworth Parish Council
Harris Land Management	Kingston on Soar Parish Council
Harworth Group	Kinoulton Parish Council
Hathern Parish Council	Kittyhawk Aerodrome
Havenwood Construction Limited	Kneeton Parish Meeting
Hawksmoor	Knightwood Developments Limited
Hawksworth Parish Meeting	Lambert Smith Hampton
Hayhoe Marine Services	Landstack
Health and Safety Executive	Langar cum Barnstone Parish Council
Heaton Planinng	Langridge Homes Ltd
Heaton Planning	Leaders Romans Group
Hickling Parish Council	Leicester City Council
Historic England	Leicestershire County Council
Hollins Strategic Land	Leicestershire Police and Crime Commissioner
Holme Pierrepont And Gamston Parish Council	Leith Planning
Home Builders Federation	Pleydell Smithyman Ltd
Homes England	Lidl GB Ltd
Hortons' Estate Limited	Lightsource BP
Hoton Parish Council	Lockington and Hemington Parish Council
Hoveringham Parish Council	Lone Star Land
HTA Design LLP	Lone Star Land Ltd
IBA Planning Ltd	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish
Iceni Projects	Lucy White Planning
ID Planning	M1 Agency
IDC & Associates	Mansfield District Council
IM Land Limited	Marine Management Organisation
Infraland	Marrons Planning
Inland Waterways Association	Mather Jamie Ltd
Innes England	McCarthy Stone
Inovo Consulting	Meadow School of Riding
Inspired Villages	Melton Borough Council
Integrated Care Board	Midlands Engine
Jelson Homes	Midlands Land Portfolio Limited
JG Woodhouse & Sons	Mike Downes Planning Consultant
Jigsaw Homes	

Ministry of Defence Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding	Paget Estate
Mobile Operators Association	Parker Strategic Land Limited
National Air Traffic Services Ltd	Pegasus Group
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Pell Frischmann
National Grid Electricity Distribution Plc	Penland Estates
National Grid Electricity Transmission	Persimmon Homes
National Highways	Peter Tyers Associates
Natural England	Peveril Securities Limited & Omnivale Pension Scheme
neighbourhood-planning.co.uk	Planning & Design Group Limited
Nottingham Express Transit	Planning Issues
Network Rail	Planning Potential
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Planning Prospects Ltd
Newton Nottingham LLP	Plumtree Parish Council
Newton Parish Council	PMC Land and Planning Limited
Nexus Planning	Positive Homes Ltd
NHS England	Profectus Town Planning
NHS Nottm & Notts ICB	Q+A Planning Ltd
NHS Property Services	Quiet Tiger Aviation
nineteen47	Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council
Normanton on Soar Parish Council	Radcliffe-on-Trent Residents Assoc
Normanton-on-Soar Parish Council	Railfuture
Normanton-on-the-Wolds Parish Council	Rapleys LLP
North West Leicestershire District Council	Ratcliffe Marina
Northern Trust Land Ltd	Ratcliffe on Soar Parish Meeting
Notcutts Ltd	Ratcliffe-on-Soar Parish Meeting
Nottingham City Council	Redrow Homes East Midlands Ltd
Nottingham City Transport	Regatta Way Sports Club
Nottingham Credit Union	Regen
Nottingham Green Party	Rempstone Parish Council
Nottingham Students' Partnership	Rentplus UK
Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers	RES
Nottinghamshire CPRE	rg+p Ltd.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Richard Ling & Associates
Nottinghamshire Police	Richborough Commercial
Nottinghamshire Ramblers	Richborough Estates Ltd
Nottinghamshire Sports Properties	Ridge and Partners LLP
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Royal Mail
Office of Rail and Road	Ruddington Parish Council
Orchestra Land	Rula Developments Ltd
Orston Parish Council	Rural Insight Land & Development
OSVAID	Rural Solutions
Owthorpe Parish Meeting	Rushcliffe Green Party
Oxalis Planning	Rushcliffe School

Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group	TASCforce
Samworth Farms Limited	Taylor Wimpey
Savills UK Ltd	TaylorMade Group
Sawley Parish Council	Terra
Saxondale Parish Meeting	Tetlow King Planning
Scarrington Parish Meeting	The Coal Authority / The Mining Remediation Authority
Screveton Parish Meeting	The Cranmer Group of Parishes
Sequence Ltd	The Crown Estate
Seven Homes	The Gardens Trust
Severn Trent	The General Aviation Awareness Council
Sharphill Action Group	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Sharphill Management Services	The Planning Bureau
Shelford Parish Council	The Planning Inspectorate
Shelton Parish Meeting	The University of Nottingham
Sherwood Conservatives	The Victoria Centre Partnership
Shouler and Son	The Woodland Trust
Sibthorpe Parish Meeting	Theatres Trust
South Notts Association for Visually Impaired Group	Theta Squared Aviation
Spawforths	Thomas Heap
Sport England	Thoroton & District Branch - Newark Conservative Association
St James' Church NOS	Thoroton Parish Meeting
Stagfield Group	Three
Stainton Planning	Thrumpton Parish Meeting
Stanford on Soar Parish Council	Tithby and Wiverton Parish Meeting
Stanford-on-Soar Parish Council	Tollerton Against Backdoor Urbanisation
Stantec UK	Tollerton Parish Council
Stanton on the Wolds Parish Council	tor&co
Stanton-on-the-Wolds Parish Council	Trebor Developments LLP
Stathern Parish Council	Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board
Staunton Parish Meeting	Trustees of Hammond Farm
Stoke Bardolph Parish Council	Turley
Strata	Uniper UK Limited
Strawson Group Investments Ltd	Unite Notts Retired Members Branch
Strutt and Parker	Unite the Union
Sustainable Transport Nottingham	Upper Broughton Parish Council
Sutton Bonington Local Residents Committee	Upper Saxondale
Sutton Bonington Parish Council	Vale Planning Consultants
Swift Aero Maintenance	Via East Midlands
Swiftaero	Vistry Homes Ltd
Swords Aviation	W Westerman Ltd
Syerston Parish Meeting	Wellesbourne Matters
T/as Hawk Helicopters	West Bridgford Hockey Club



West Bridgford LAF Traffic and Transport Group	Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
West Bridgford Local Area Forum	Wood PLC
West Leake Parish Council	Woodall Homes Ltd
West Leake Parish Meeting	Woodland Trust
Western Power Distribution	WSP
Whatton in the Vale Parish Council	www.GeoGreenPower.com
Whitefields Farm	Wymeswold Parish Council
Widmerpool Parish Council	Wysall And Thorpe-in-the-Glebe Parish Council
William Davis Homes	Zesta Planning Ltd
Willoughby on the Wolds Parish Council	Over 1,500 private consultees, other businesses and other organisations

**Table 2: List of bodies who responded to consultation on draft Developer Contributions SPD**

Canal & River Trust	Nottinghamshire County Council
Environment Agency	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council
Gotham Parish Council	Ruddington Parish Council
Historic England	The Coal Authority
Leake Ward Independents	Tollerton Parish Council
Natural England	A total of five private individuals

**Table 3: Summary of consultation comments, responses to comments and modifications to SPD**

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

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

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

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
				Paragraph 3.16 –amend “...wheelchair adaptable homes and/or a relevant planning...”
10.	Resident 03	General	Concerns over developers building on long-standing community recreational areas (e.g. Nottingham Airfield), used for walking, horse riding, wildlife watching, and flying. Questions how such spaces can be meaningfully replaced.	While the concerns are noted, this is not directly a matter for this SPD. It is concerned with the process and mechanisms for securing new or improved infrastructure to support new development.
11.	Resident 03	General	Loss of skilled jobs (e.g. engineers and pilots at Nottingham Airfield) due to development. Argues that developers cannot replace such employment opportunities through housing plans.	This is not directly a matter for the SPD. While housing delivery is a priority, the Local Plan seeks to balance this with economic sustainability. Proposals will be assessed for their impact on employment, and where appropriate planning obligations may support local skills, training, or employment initiatives.
12.	Resident 03	3.73–3.80	Highlights the irreversible loss of biodiversity at development sites like Nottingham Airfield. Expresses concern that biodiversity net gain is not feasible in such cases.	The SPD supports national policy requiring measurable biodiversity net gain, but recognises that in some cases, full replacement may not be feasible. Proposals will be assessed rigorously, and off-site compensation may be considered where justified.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
13.	Resident 03	General	Raises serious concerns about contaminated land at Nottingham Airfield and developers' poor track records in remediation. Calls for stronger due diligence and safety checks to protect future residents and the local community.	This is not a matter for this SPD. All development proposals must comply with national and local policies on land remediation, including thorough site investigations and risk assessments. Planning conditions will be used to ensure appropriate remediation is carried, with oversight from environmental health and relevant statutory bodies.
14.	Resident 04	General	Expresses grave concern over toxic contamination at the Nottingham Airfield site proposed for development by Vistry Group. Emphasizes that full remediation must be enforced and policed by Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC). Warns that failure to do so could result in future health risks and shared liability between the developer and RBC.	This is not a matter for this SPD. All development proposals must comply with national and local policies on land remediation, including thorough site investigations and risk assessments. Planning conditions will be used to ensure appropriate remediation is carried, with oversight from environmental health and relevant statutory bodies.
15.	Resident 05	General	Recommends mandatory like-for-like replacement of recreational facilities lost to development, in line with NPPF Paragraph 104. Cites Nottingham City Airport as an example of a site with recreational value that should be replaced or compensated for.	This is a Local Plan policy matter and not something that would be addressed through the SPD.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
16.	Resident 05	General	Highlights the need to replace skilled employment lost through development, such as engineering and aviation jobs. Suggests developers contribute to vocational training or new business premises to match the economic value of displaced enterprises.	This is a Local Plan policy matter and not something that would be addressed through the SPD.
17.	Resident 05	3.73-3.80	Opposes biodiversity offsetting and calls for strict enforcement of onsite biodiversity net gain. Warns against translocation of species and urges developers to exhaust all onsite options before considering offsite measures.	The SPD aligns with national policy requiring developers to prioritise onsite enhancements and avoid harmful practices such as inappropriate species translocation. All proposals will be assessed rigorously to ensure ecological integrity.
18.	Resident 05	3.57-3.59	Calls for additional health contributions when developing contaminated land, including funding for NHS services, health surveillance, and public education. Aligns with NPPF Paragraph 196 on contamination risk.	In line with NPPF Paragraph 196, developers must demonstrate that land is safe for use. Through planning obligations, developers may be required to contribute to healthcare infrastructure where justified. While compensation for medical costs is outside planning scope, the SPD supports contributions to NHS services to address increased demand and long-term community health needs.
19.	Resident 05	General	Recommends mandatory proof of insurance and indemnity for	While planning legislation does not permit conditions or planning obligations requiring

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			developers to protect against harm to workers, residents, and future occupants. Suggests this be a condition of planning approval.	insurance or indemnity, developers must comply with statutory health and safety regulations.
<b>Councils &amp; Parish Councils</b>				
20.	Nottinghamshire County Council	2.31-2.40	<p>NCC should be explicitly referenced as a consultee in the negotiation process.</p> <p>NCC legal review costs should be covered by applicants.</p> <p>Welcomes reference to NCC as a signatory.</p> <p>SPD should include NCC's monitoring charges, as outlined in NCC's Developer Contributions Strategy.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.25 already references the need to have regard to the Nottinghamshire County Council's (NCC) Developer Contribution Strategy; however, it is accepted that more explicit reference to NCC's role in the process of negotiating, securing and monitoring planning obligations would be helpful.</p> <p><u>Modifications</u></p> <p>Add the following new paragraph after 2.12:</p> <p>"The Council will charge a proportionate and reasonable monitoring fee for the monitoring of and reporting on the delivery of planning obligations and Section 106 agreements. The County Council will also charge a monitoring fee for planning obligations and Section 106 agreements together with a separate charge to cover its costs involved</p>



	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
				<p>with administering payments in line with the County Council's Developer Contributions Strategy."</p> <p>Add to paragraph 2.22: "<u>Nottinghamshire County Council will also recharge developers for reasonable legal costs incurred in agreeing planning obligations for its services. Further details are referenced in its Developer Contributions Strategy.</u>"</p> <p>Add paragraph 2.31 reference to "<u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u>" in addition to Town/Parish councils.</p> <p>Add to the end of second paragraph of Appendix 1: "<u>, including details in respect of its fees for monitoring planning obligations.</u>"</p>
21.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.21-3.25	<p>Add Public Rights of Way (PROW) to improvements list.</p> <p>Add paragraph on public transport services, including community/demand-responsive buses.</p> <p>Provide link or appendix for A52 Memorandum of Understanding.</p>	<p>Following these comments, changes to the document would be helpful. Although, it is not possible to provide a link to the A52 Memorandum of Understanding.</p> <p><u>Modifications</u></p> <p>Add new paragraph following 3.21: "<u>Enhancements to public transport services may be secured though planning obligation or condition and may include new routes or extensions to existing services</u></p>

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			Add reference to NCC's Developer Contributions Strategy for further guidance and costs.	<p><u>designed to serve a new development. There might also be circumstances where a contribution is required for community or demand responsive bus services, in order to serve smaller sites including within rural areas.</u></p> <p>Add to list at paragraph 3.22: <u>"Public Rights of Way (PROW);</u></p> <p>Add to end of paragraph 3.25: <u>"Further guidance and costs for highways and transport infrastructure and services can be found in the County Council's Developer Contributions Strategy."</u></p>
22.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.52-3.56	Clarify implications of secondary education being a CIL funding stream. Confirm when planning obligations would or would not be sought.	<p>It is accepted that relevant text could usefully be added to document.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Add to the end of paragraph 3.56: <u>"..., apart from the provision of a new secondary school on the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton strategic allocation site. This is expected to be provide by the developers as a planning obligation. This site is not subject to CIL payments."</u></p>
23.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.62–3.64	Add explanation for stock-based contributions when physical	The SPD already refers to "increasing stock levels at existing libraries" and cross refers to the County

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			expansion is not needed. Most contributions are for stock, not buildings.	<p>Council's Developer Contributions Strategy. However, the suggested additional text is considered a helpful addition.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Add after paragraph 3.63 the following new paragraph: <u>"Where a library building is able to accommodate the extra demand created by a new development, but it is known and demonstrable that the stock levels are inadequate to meet the needs of the additional population (based on recommended stock levels), a contribution will be sought towards increasing the stock level at that library to accommodate the additional population generated"</u>.</p>
24.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.65–3.68	Supports references to NCC as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).	Noted
25.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.71	Supports reference to Household Waste Recycling Centres and NCC's Developer Contributions Strategy.	Noted.
26.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Appendix 1 – Schedule of Financial Contributions	Link to NCC's Developer Contributions Strategy should point to the webpage, not the PDF.	Noted – the link will be changed to the webpage and not the PDF.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			<p>“Bus Infrastructure” should be renamed “Bus Infrastructure and Services.”</p> <p>Clarify that Travel Plan fees cover monitoring, not plan preparation.</p> <p>Add SEND education contribution: £104,556 per place.</p>	<p>The suggested amendments to Appendix 1 are appropriate.</p> <p><u>Modifications</u> Rename “Bus Infrastructure” as “Bus Infrastructure and Services.”</p> <p>Add the following text to the financial contribution column for Travel Plans: <u>“These fees for Travel Plans cover the monitoring of Travel Plans and not their preparation”</u></p> <p>Add the following text to the financial contribution column for Education: <u>“Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) education contribution is £104,556 per place.”</u></p>
27.	Nottinghamshire County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority	3.65- 3.68	<p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are discussed in the Residential Design Guide which we support.</p> <p>NCC (LLFA) suggests a number of detailed technical implementation requirements.</p>	<p>While the comments are noted and are helpful, the suggested specific technical requirements for SuDS provision are considered too detailed for this SPD. The purpose of the SPD to support how SUDS are secured in association with new development, rather than provide detailed specifications for SuDS. These are possibly matters for other planning policy documents</p>
28.	Gotham Parish Council	3.21-3.22	<p>The Parish Council is disappointed at the lack of actual sustainable</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPD to support how sustainable transport measures are secured in</p>

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			travel targets within the document and feel that every new development 'must' have a sustainable travel connection (cycle and pedestrian) to existing sustainable travel infrastructure.	association with new development, rather than detailed requirements or targets for those measures. These are matters for other planning policy documents
29.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	2.24	Parish councils should be formally recognised as key stakeholders in identifying infrastructure needs, especially for community facilities, open space, and local transport. Early engagement at the pre-application stage is essential to ensure local priorities are reflected in heads of terms.	The SPD already recognises the role and importance of parish councils at the pre-application and application stages. However, additional references to the need to engage with parish/town council are have been added to the document (see further responses below).
30.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	Asset transfer	Commutated sums must reflect realistic, inflation-adjusted to avoid unfunded liabilities. The SPD should commit to reviewing commuted sum calculations regularly. Parishes should retain the right to decline transfers where funding or capacity is insufficient. Clear guidance should be provided on the legal and financial process of	To ensure that the SPD does not become out of date and that commuted sums are sufficient, its Appendix 1 indicates that financial contributions are indicative only and are subject to change based on the context of each individual application and subject to indexation.  Parish councils would only be in receipt of commuted sums or new assets at their own agreement.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			asset transfer, including insurance and health and safety obligations.	The inclusion of the guidance sought in respect of asset transfer goes beyond the scope of the SPD.
31.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	Community facility priorities	The Parish Council identifies the key infrastructure items it believes the SPD must prioritise on the back of Radcliffe on Trent having already absorbed significant development in recent years and with further large-scale growth planned. This includes recreation and open space, community buildings, active travel and public transport , flood mitigation and drainage, health care and education.	The role of the SPD is not to prioritise which infrastructure should be delivered and where. This is the role of, in particular, the Local Plan and its infrastructure delivery plan. This SPD focuses on the delivery mechanisms for new or improved infrastructure where has already been identified as necessary in accordance with Local Plan policy requirements.
32.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	Transparency and accountability	Parish councils require transparency in how developer contributions (whether via Section 106 or CIL) are allocated. Parish councils should be able to track Section 106 and CIL funds generated in their area and how they are spent.	Annual infrastructure funding statements are published in line with national requirements, detailing S106 and CIL income and expenditure.
33.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	3.2	Contributions should allow for flexible use to adapt to changing	Where appropriate, Section 106 agreements are drafted to allow for adaptable use within defined

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			demographics and community needs over time.	categories, ensuring contributions remain effective and relevant over time while meeting planning obligations.
34.	Ruddington Parish Council	General	Supports the Draft Developer Contributions SPD and welcomes its intent to provide clarity and consistency for developers and communities.	The Council welcomes the support for the Draft Developer Contributions SPD.
35.	Tollerton Parish Council	General	Supports the preparation of the SPD, which improves transparency and consistency in developer contributions.	The Council welcomes the support.
36.	Tollerton Parish Council	Planning obligation negotiation	The SPD does not clearly explain the process or timing of negotiating planning obligations. Recommend inclusion of a workflow diagram showing key stages and when consultation with stakeholders (including parish councils) occurs. Suggest inclusion of standard templates for obligations and conditions, as supported by Planning Practice Guidance (ref: 23b-016-20190901), to improve	The SPD is considered to provide sufficient clarity. While Planning Practice Guidance on Planning Obligations supports the use of standard forms and templates for planning obligations, given that these may need to change over time, inclusion of such templates within the SPD is not considered appropriate.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			accessibility for non-specialist audiences.	
37.	Tollerton Parish Council	East of Gamston/ North of Tollerton strategic allocation	<p>The SPD references CIL as a key funding mechanism, but Gamston Fields is exempt from CIL. Request additional guidance in the SPD on how infrastructure (e.g. schools, healthcare, open space) will be delivered on strategic sites without CIL.</p> <p>Recommend outlining a methodology or framework for coordinating contributions across multiple developers within strategic allocations.</p>	<p>The East of Gamston/ North of Tollerton strategic allocation is the only strategic site where CIL does not apply. Any additional guidance regarding infrastructure provision on this site specifically, including coordinating contributions across multiple developers, is better dealt with by the separate SPD being prepared for the site.</p> <p>The inclusion of guidance to deal with other potential future CIL exempt sites is not warranted because the rest of the Borough is covered by CIL charging zones where payments are applicable.</p>
38.	Tollerton Parish Council	3.44-3.46	<p>Parish Councils should be given first refusal for adopting and managing open spaces, parks, and leisure facilities within new developments.</p> <p>Tollerton Parish Council supports long-term stewardship of green infrastructure, including green buffer land at Gamston Fields (Policy 25), which aligns with the</p>	<p>Adoption arrangements are considered on a case-by-case basis and parish councils may be offered first refusal where appropriate but this cannot be insisted upon. The wording included in the SPD is considered appropriate in this respect.</p> <p>In response of the request for additional guidance concerning the functionality of open space and the early involvement of parish councils in their design and specification, the following text is proposed.</p>



	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			<p>Neighbourhood Plan and local aspirations.</p> <p>The Parish Council welcomes the principle of long-term ownership and stewardship but highlights three key considerations for inclusion in the SPD:</p> <p>A. design and functionality – spaces should avoid integrating sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) or biodiversity features that carry legal obligations beyond Parish Council powers. Clear separation of these elements is needed.</p> <p>B. early involvement – Parish Councils should be engaged in design and specification from the outset to ensure consistency and suitability for long-term management.</p> <p>c. financial support – transfers must include funding packages to cover maintenance for at least 10–15 years, as initial costs would otherwise impose a significant burden.</p>	<p><u>Modification</u></p> <p>Add the following text to paragraph 3.44: <u>“Where a Parish/Town Council is expected to adopt and manage any play spaces, sports pitches or other recreational open space, they should be engaged with and given the opportunity to influence the design and specification of those spaces. This should include consideration as to whether features such as SuDs or biodiversity improvements can be incorporated within open space, given that this might impede a Parish/Town Council’s ability to adopt the space.”</u></p> <p>Mention is already included regarding the need to provide for 15-years of management and maintenance of the community open space, leisure and formal sports provision.</p>

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			The Parish Council also advocates for early pre-application discussions between developers and Parish Councils to address these issues.	
<b>Statutory Consultees and Local Groups</b>				
43.	Canal & River Trust	General	Has no comments in the draft SPD.	Noted.
44.	Environment Agency	General	Has no comments in the draft SPD.	Noted.
45.	Historic England	Table 1 – Infrastructure Requirements	<p>Recommend inclusion of historic environment/heritage assets in Table 1 to clarify that contributions may be required for heritage-related works.</p> <p>Suggested entry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Likely mechanism: Planning obligation and/or planning condition</li> <li>– Application: Housing developments and selected others</li> <li>– Threshold: Case by case</li> <li>– Policy: Local Plan Part 2 Policies 28 and 29.</li> </ul>	The remit of the SPD is specifically in respect of developer contributions towards new or improved infrastructure provision to support new development. This does not clearly relate to matters of heritage. It is accepted that heritage related matters may be the subject of S106 agreements, but it is not relevant for heritage matters to be specific covered within a Developer Contribution SPD such as this.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
46.	Historic England	Appendix – Schedule of Financial Contributions	Recommend adding historic environment/heritage assets as an infrastructure type. Suggested entry: – Consultee: Rushcliffe Borough Council. – Financial contribution: Case by case basis.	The remit of the SPD is specifically in respect of developer contributions towards new or improved infrastructure provision to support new development. This does not clearly relate to matters of heritage. It is accepted that heritage related matters may be the subject of S106 agreements, but it is not relevant for heritage matters to be specific covered within a Developer Contribution SPD such as this.
47.	Natural England	General	No comments are offered at this stage. If the SPD is amended in a way that affects the natural environment, further consultation is requested.	Noted.
48.	The Coal Authority	General	Has no comments in the draft SPD.	Noted.
49.	Leake Ward Independents	General	Public open space and facilities intended for general use should be adopted into the public realm and funded via council tax, supported by commuted sums. Highways, sports pitches, and drainage systems should be built to adoptable standards to enable future adoption.	The Council cannot insist on adoption and that open spaces and facilities are built to adoptable standards. It is not Borough Council policy to adopt and manage open spaces. This matter is outside the remit of the SPD.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
50.	Leake Ward Independents	General	Town/parish councils, allotment societies, sports clubs, and community groups should be consulted early to determine appropriate provision and future management arrangements. Commuted sums should support long-term maintenance by relevant organisations, avoiding reliance on resident management charges.	The SPD refers to early engagement with external bodies where appropriate and specifically mentions town/parish councils. This is considered sufficient.
51.	Leake Ward Independents	General	Larger areas of open space should be adopted; small, cosmetic green spaces often create unnecessary maintenance burdens and could be incorporated into private plots. Layouts should prioritise adoptable roads, street lighting, and visitor parking over narrow, unlit cul-de-sacs and shared drives.	The remit of this SPD is not to provide guidance on the design and layout of developments. These are matters for Local Plan policy or specific design related guidance.
52.	Leake Ward Independents	Section 106 Agreements	If residents are required to pay management charges, S106 agreements should insist on the model of a residents' management company which gives more rights than the embedded management company model.	There is no legal or policy basis on which this can be insisted.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
53.	Leake Ward Independents	2.14	Add reference encouraging roads to be built to adoptable standards and adopted where possible. Public roads should meet consistent standards and not impose private maintenance costs on residents.	This SPD provides guidance on where planning obligations will be sought and the procedures around this. Matters such as whether roads should be adopted or not is outside the remit for the SPD.
54.	Leake Ward Independents	2.31	Amend to ensure Town/Parish Councils are always consulted, not just “where relevant.” Local representatives best understand community needs.	Changes to the paragraph are relevant.  <u>Modification</u> Change third paragraph of 2.31 as follows: “Negotiation will involve consultation with internal departments and external bodies, <del>which may include</del> <u>including</u> Town/Parish councils <u>and Nottinghamshire County Council</u> <del>where relevant</del> , to determine the conditions and/or obligations necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.”
55.	Leake Ward Independents	3.15-3.16	Strengthen wording to increase and enforce provision of wheelchair adaptable dwellings. Current minimum does not reflect Rushcliffe's ageing population.	This is a Local Plan policy matter. The SPD cannot introduce policy requirements; to do so would be outside the remit of this SPD.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
56.	Leake Ward Independents	3.22	<p>Add bullet: "Provision of pedestrian and cycling linkages between estates to encourage active transport and provide safe off road routes particularly for school routes."</p> <p>Safe, off-road routes are essential, especially for school access.</p>	<p>In order to address a comment made by Nottinghamshire County Council, it is proposed that Public Rights of Way are included to the list. This is considered to also sufficiently address this point.</p> <p><u>Modification</u>: Add to list at paragraph 3.22: "<u>Public Rights of Way (PROW)</u>";</p>
57.	Leake Ward Independents	3.30-3.31	<p>Add requirement to consult Town/Parish Councils and local allotment providers.</p> <p>These groups understand local demand and may adopt/manage sites.</p>	<p>Some relevant wording is appropriate.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Add to paragraph 3.31: "<u>Early engagement with the Council, relevant Parish/Town Council and/or other relevant body is important prior to the submission of a planning application.</u>"</p>
58.	Leake Ward Independents	3.39	<p>Add to "In certain cases, it may be preferable to improve existing provision" the following text "<u>or collaborate with adjoining developers</u> to provide more extensive shared facilities".</p> <p>."</p> <p>Shared facilities can offer better value and community benefit.</p>	<p>Agreed that this text would be useful.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> – add to paragraph 3.39 "<u>or collaborate with an adjoining developer to provide more extensive shared facilities.</u>"</p>

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
59.	Leake Ward Independents	3.43	Amend to include Town/Parish Councils explicitly. They manage local play spaces and reflect resident views.	Agreed it is appropriate to refer to Parish/Town Councils where appropriate.  <u>Modification</u> –following “Early engagement with the Council..” at paragraph 3.43 add “ <u>and the relevant Parish/Town Council</u> ”.
60.	Leake Ward Independents	3.44	Add “and allotments” to list of facilities requiring management and maintenance. Allotments need long-term oversight.	Reference to “Community open space, leisure and formal sports provision” encompasses a range of such uses including allotments. Allotments therefore do not require specific mention within paragraph 3.44.
61.	Leake Ward Independents	3.45	Amend to reflect that adoption may be appropriate in special cases. SPD should remain open to future policy changes and government direction. The suggested wording is: “The Council <del>typically</del> does not <u>normally</u> take on the management or maintenance of open space <u>at present but developers are invited to discuss this with the Council to ascertain if this is a special case or if a policy or regulatory change has occurred.</u> ”	The existing wording is considered more appropriate and reflects current Council policy. The suggested wording would not help to clarify matters.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
62.	Leake Ward Independents	3.46	Update tense: “has worked” and add link to the Guide. The Guide is now in place and should be referenced.	This change and the addition of a link to the guide is appropriate..  <u>Modification</u> At paragraph 3.46 amend “is working” to “ <u>has worked</u> ”.
63.	Leake Ward Independents	3.49-3.50	Clarify that contributions may also support community-run facilities (e.g. village halls, sports clubs). Not all indoor leisure is provided by RBC.	The paragraph relates to all indoor and leisure provision and does not specify who will run them. It is not considered necessary therefore to refer specifically to “community-run facilities”.
64.	Leake Ward Independents	3.59	Amend to refer to the nature of development: “...not only on the scale <u>and nature</u> of the proposed development...”  Plus add: “and/or a specialist development creates additional healthcare needs.” Some developments (e.g. for older people) may require higher or different contributions.	The paragraph considers needs arising from all development, whatever its type. It is appropriate to refer to “the nature” of development, but it is considered unnecessary to also refer explicitly to specialist accommodation.  <u>Modification</u> At paragraph 3.59, after “not only on the scale” add “ <u>and nature</u> ”.
65.	Leake Ward Independents	3.60-3.61	Add requirement to consult local providers (e.g. parish councils, village halls).	Add appropriate text to address this comment.  <u>Modification</u>



	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			These groups best understand local needs and should not be burdened with management charges.	Add to end of paragraph 3.60: "..., <u>Parish/Town Councils and any other bodies as appropriate.</u> "
66.	Leake Ward Independents	3.65	Add: "Direct engagement with the local Water Board is encouraged. In areas covered by an Internal Drainage Board, engagement with them is also encouraged." Holistic SuDS planning may be needed if future legislation changes.	Add appropriate text to address this comment.  <u>Modification</u> Add to paragraph 3.65: " <u>Such engagement may also be necessary with the Internal Drainage Broad, in areas with one, and Severn Trent Water.</u> "
67.	Leake Ward Independents	3.66	Add "in perpetuity" to clarify long-term responsibility.	This addition reference is considered unnecessary.
68.	Leake Ward Independents	3.68	Add following new paragraph: "Where the site includes a watercourse or is adjacent to a watercourse the management and maintenance of the watercourse should be included in the overall management scheme for open space, to ensure that the responsibilities as riparian landowner are met. A plan should identify the relevant watercourse(s)."	Any riparian responsibilities relating to the management and maintenance of watercourses are not matters that can be dealt with directly through the planning system and its relevant legislation. This additional suggested text is therefore not appropriate for inclusion in the SPD.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			Ensures riparian responsibilities are met.	
69.	Leake Ward Independents	3.69	It is not clear what is intended here. These should not be close to housing as they would be unacceptable to residents. Provision within the site could be appropriate for the largest strategic sites perhaps?	The location of such facilities relative to new housing development would be a matter for individual planning applications. Guidance on what are appropriate locations for such facilities is not a matter for this SPD.
70.	Leake Ward Independents	3.70	The linked document should be updated	While the comment is noted, this advice document does not form part of the SPD.
71.	Leake Ward Independents	3.77	Add preference for on-site delivery and hierarchy for off-site gains. Contributions in lieu should be a last resort.	The hierarchy of provision is not directly a matter for this SPD. Therefore, changes to the SPD are not appropriate.
72.	Leake Ward Independents	3.81	Add reference to EV charging infrastructure. Clarify policy basis to avoid appeal issues (e.g. 25/00508/FUL).	To make this a requirement would need to be dealt with through the Local Plan process. New policy requirements cannot be introduced through an SPD.
73.	Leake Ward Independents	3.84	Add paragraph encouraging provision of defibrillators, blood packs, or serviced locations for emergency equipment.	To make this a requirement would need to be dealt with through the Local Plan process. New policy requirements cannot be introduced through an SPD.

	Name	Paragraph/ topic reference	Comment	Response to comment
			Important for developments expanding away from existing services.	
74.	Leake Ward Independents	Appendix 1	<p>Add Town/Parish Councils and community sports providers as consultees under Indoor Sport and Leisure.</p> <p>Add Water Boards and Internal Drainage Boards as consultees under Flood Mitigation and Water Infrastructure.</p> <p>Update Wheeled Bins section to reflect new bin types and charges.</p>	<p>It is appropriate to add reference to own/Parish Councils and community sports providers as consultees under Indoor Sport and Leisure.</p> <p>It is appropriate to add reference to Internal Drainage Broads and Severn Trent Water</p> <p>For a new bins, the details are not yet included in the "Planning Advice Waste Collection Services Charging Developers for Wheeled Refuse Containers" document.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> At Appendix 1, add the following text to the consultee column for Indoor Sport and Leisure: <u>"Town/Parish Councils and community sports providers"</u></p> <p>At Appendix 1, add the following text to the consultee column for Flood Mitigation and Water Infrastructure: <u>"Internal Drainage Broads Severn Trent Water"</u></p>

