

5 November 2025



Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rugby Road, West Bridgford
Nottingham. NG2 7YG

David Bainbridge MRTPI
Planning Director

By email only to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

savills.com

Dear Sir / Madam

**Consultation on the East of Gamston / North of Tollerton Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, October 2025
Response on Behalf of Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land**

I write on behalf of Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land in respect of the above consultation on the East of Gamston / North of Tollerton Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document ("the SPD").

This submission comprises this letter and the completed representations form.

Savills and Turley have led as planning advisers to Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land and Vistry on the co-ordination of the SPD. This response has been co-ordinated between these parties, but separate submissions made.

Introduction and Background

Taylor Wimpey is one of the UK's largest residential developers. As a responsible developer Taylor Wimpey is committed to working with local people and communities. Taylor Wimpey is an important stakeholder in the planning for, and delivery of, new places in Greater Nottingham. These new places include Edwalton and emerging development at Gamston/Tollerton and Cotgrave.

Barwood Land was established in 2009 and is one of the UK's leading land promoters. It has an exceptional track record in delivering planning approvals and specialises in every stage of the planning process, from securing sites to the promotion of the site, alongside the navigation of applications through the planning system onto delivery of development and Sustainable Urban Extensions.

Our response to the consultation is based on our land interests at the strategic site and responds only to aspects of the consultation which are considered relevant.

We are supportive of the SPD but consider there are aspects for consideration by the Council ahead of progressing the SPD through to adoption.

This response provides specific responses to relevant aspects of the consultation following an explanation of the Site and on the national consultation on planning reform.



Land East of Gamston and North of Tollerton

The Site is allocated as a sustainable urban extension under Policy 25 in the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, adopted December 2014.

Policy 25 of the Local Plan Part 1 identifies a strategic allocation east of Gamston and north of Tollerton. The policy is for a mixed-use development including around 2,500 dwellings up to 2028, up to a further 1,500 homes post 2028, around 20 hectares of employment development, a neighbourhood centre and other community facilities as appropriate.

This allocation has continued through adoption of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies, in October 2019.

This strategic site is contained within the emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP) at draft proposed Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe). This proposes the location as a strategic site for mixed-use development including around 4,000 dwellings, around 15 hectares of employment development, a neighbourhood centre and other community facilities as appropriate.

The GNSP has been updated to include the following wording:

“All development should contribute on a fair, consistent and proportionate basis towards infrastructure requirements including, where appropriate, where infrastructure has been forward funded or delivered by others but is necessary for the delivery of the overall development.”

We have raised concerns about aspects of the emerging GNSP, which has yet to be submitted for examination.

It is understood that the GNSP is intended to replace part 1 local plans in the Greater Nottingham Area but not all of the part 2 plans. Appendix D: Superseded or Withdrawn Policies within adopted Local Plans in the GNSP shows only some policies from within the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies.

The Site is subject to two planning applications for parts of the sustainable urban extension. The planning application by Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land is under application reference: 20/03244/OUT, and the planning application by Vistry is under application reference: 24/00347/HYBRID. We expect these planning applications to be the subject of formal changes, re-consultation by the Council and presentation to committee in spring 2026.

The masterplanning process and engagement over many years has informed the draft SPD and this is considered to have met the Policy 25 requirement that the design and layout of the proposal for this SUE be determined through a masterplanning process.

Adopted Policy 25 and emerging Policy 31 do not require the preparation and adoption of an SPD for this strategic site and it does not require an SPD to be adopted prior to the positive determination of planning applications on parts of the site.

Appendix C: Housing Trajectories within the GNSP includes a housing trajectory for Rushcliffe Borough Council. East of Gamston / North of Tollerton is included within this trajectory, with an estimated first delivery of 88 dwellings in 2028/29, 176 dwellings in 2029/30 and then 220 dwellings per year over the remainder of the proposed plan period to 2040/41. The total estimated delivery of new homes from this sustainable urban extension allocated in 2014, is 2,684 dwellings by 31 March 2041.

This would be some 27 years since allocation of this site to get to this estimated delivery. This stalled site can only deliver through the grant of planning permissions and relevant approvals to enable housebuilders to deliver on the Site.

To see delivery of the first homes by 31 March 2029 will need the planning permissions to be granted as soon as possible in 2026.

Responses on the Draft SPD

An overarching comment is that while the SPD should provide sufficient certainty to guide and enable delivery of the development, it must also allow for an appropriate degree of flexibility given the likely long build-out period and the need to avoid unnecessarily replicating the planning application process, which should remain the appropriate vehicle for addressing detailed technical work, mitigation measures, and site-specific design matters.

There is acknowledgement of this at **paragraph 1.9**, but this only goes so far as to the street corridors, development blocks and green and blue infrastructure. This overarching principle applies to the entire development, including infrastructure provision.

It is good to see the comment at **paragraph 1.18**, that development is expected to be brought forward through separate planning applications, over a number of years, all set within the framework of local plan policy and the SPD.

We support the masterplanning for this site, as contained in the SPD. **The Framework Masterplan** and the design objectives which inform it are a well-considered and appropriate design response to the site's context and infrastructure requirements. The type of land-uses and the relationship between them is well reasoned and supported by a significant body of evidence, prepared over a number of years through both the SPD and the two planning applications (which have been subject to several rounds of consultation with statutory consultees).

In respect of the M4(3)(A) (wheelchair adaptable) position at **paragraph 4.12**, we note that the adopted policy requires a proportion of adaptable dwellings, and that the evidence around the percentage in the latest evidence is yet to be tested through the GNSP examination, and so the SPD should not be prescriptive in advance of this.

At **paragraph 4.53**, it would be relevant to refer to the update to the guidance issued post 2016.

At **paragraph 4.55**, it is relevant to state that the mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity does not apply to planning applications valid prior to introduction of the provisions under the Act.

Some of the detail at **paragraph 4.64** around primary and secondary streets may not be needed in the main body of the SPD if it is covered in the appended Site Wide Design Code.

The on-site infrastructure under **paragraph 5.2**, should state noise attenuation measures along the A52 and not specify just a fence.

We do not accept the provision of a Gamston Park & Ride under the off-site infrastructure (**page 83**). We note the wording is phased but ultimately this leads to a conclusion about a financial contribution towards delivery of a park and ride off-site. This is in danger of setting policy through SPD.

There are ongoing discussions with the Council in respect of the framework s.106 agreement, which should be reflected in an update to **section 5**, prior to adoption of the SPD.

In our view, there is too much detail within **section 5** of the SPD, particularly in relation to the emerging s.106 agreement. Given the purpose of the SPD is to provide a framework to guide development, and the fundamental

parts of the s.106 agreements have not yet been agreed, the current SPD drafting is potentially onerous, and in time may be redundant.

One specific issue is around **‘review and indexation’ on page 87** – the requirement for an annual review of infrastructure will create uncertainty and is unnecessary. Instead, the SUE’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be prepared and adopted to sit alongside the SPD, which will then inform the s.106 agreements (alongside the technical work to be agreed as part of each application). Once the s.106 agreements are signed and the decisions are issued, there is no requirement to review the infrastructure requirements (unless specified in the s.106), as that will be what has permission and therefore what will be delivered (the legal agreement will include indexation to reflect any increases in costs).

We have not sought to comment on the site wide design code or the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment, Screening Opinion Report. Prepared by the Council.

Conclusion

We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on the SPD.

We are supportive of a co-ordinated approach to planning for development on this long-stalled allocated site.

We have raised some concerns in respect of the consultation document, in the context of the site east of Gamston and North of Tollerton, which should be considered by the Council ahead of progressing the SPD through to adoption.

We look forward to receiving acknowledgement of receipt of this response, submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land.

Yours faithfully

David Bainbridge MRTPI
Planning Director

Copy: Taylor Wimpey, Barwood Land, Vistry, Turley