



# Draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Supplementary Planning Document

## Representation Form

Ref:

(For official use only)

Please return by **5pm on Wednesday 5 November 2025** to [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk) or to Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Rugby Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham. NG2 7YG

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your Comment(s)

### Part A: Personal Details

Consultee Details:

Name: **Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council**

Organisation: **Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council**

Address:

Postcode:

E-Mail Address:

**If you are an agent acting on behalf of a consultee, please enter your details here:**

Name:

Organisation:

Address:

Postcode:

E-Mail Address:

---

## Part B: Comment(s) on draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document

---

Please provide your comment or comments on the draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), together with any suggested amendments below. For each comment made, please indicate to which part of the draft SPD the comment relates (e.g. chapter and/or page number).

### COMMENTS TO RBC ON THE MASTERPLAN FOR THE STRATEGIC URBAN EXTENSION ON LAND EAST OF GAMSTON

1. With no information on the proposed works to the A52 (Lings Bar) we can only seek a general statement that the works should avoid creating rat runs through Gamston, Bassingfield and Tollerton, both during and after completion of the development. This would include minimising disruption to existing nearby residents through co-ordinated infrastructure works.
2. Emphasise the need for a Third-Party Expert (not RBC) assessment of the contamination. As Radium 226 has already been highlighted in the applicants Geo Environmental Assessment report prepared by BWB in 2014, Para 3.23 should be more detailed / specific and include appropriate levels of investigation reflecting the type of contamination potentially present on site. Intrusive studies, if set out in government guidance on how to identify / treat the sources previously identified, may be necessary particularly as large elements of the site will support schools, play areas and housing.
3. A continuous towpath / cycleway along the canal should be a high priority. Currently walkers have to climb over 2 crash barriers along the dual carriageway. The plans suggest the towpaths, either side of the dual carriageway, are connected. Cyclists and pedestrians tend to use the toucan crossing several hundred metres to the north of the canal.
4. Despite the site being identified as a Strategic Urban Extension (SUE) this is seldom mentioned. The introduction to the Site Wide Design Code para 1 should be altered as follows; This Site Wide Design Code has been produced to inform the development of land east of Gamston and north of Tollerton, which is allocated as a sustainable urban extension in the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1, adopted 2014. **Strong linkage to the existing settlement is a fundamental requirement which should major on safe pedestrian and cycle routes.**
5. There are numerous referencing errors throughout the Masterplan which we assume will be picked up when proof reading.
6. One major error is the need to correct the south-eastern boundary. The Application site follows the Polser Brook yet para 1.17 talks about Thurlbeck Dyke. We think this should be changed to Polser Brook. As Greenbelt policy requires defensible boundaries to ensure no coalescence any development in this area needs to be set well back from the boundary to achieve this goal.
7. There are many references to Health and Wellbeing. There should also be referenced the new NHS 10 year plan, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/10-year-health-plan-for-england-fit-for-the-future>) under healthcare provision.

8. “Direct, safe, lit pedestrian and cycle routes to the County Council’s aspiration for a new ‘Park and Ride’ facility to the North of Gamston Lock” should be deleted from para 4.80. To our knowledge there is no proposal for such a scheme. As stated, it is purely aspirational and does not have planning permission. If a Park and Ride is a requirement of the development all sites should be assessed.
9. To avoid the issues relating to management of the open spaces it is important they are addressed at the outset. It was unclear to us whether this is proposed to be covered by the “Long Term Stewardship.” We feel the strategy for maintaining open spaces needs to be made clearer to ensure the issue at Gamston is not repeated.

(Please continue on a separate sheet of paper as necessary)

#### **Data Protection**

The comments you submit will be used to inform the preparation of the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and will be held for the lifetime of the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework SPD. Please note that your comments and your name will not be treated as confidential and will be made available for public inspection, including online. However, contact details (including address and email) will not be made public and will not be passed to external parties.

**Please tick to confirm you agree to your comments being made public.**.....

#### **Privacy Notice**

By responding to the consultation, your details will be held by Rushcliffe Borough Council. Further details are provided in our privacy policy which is available at: [www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy-notice-and-policy/](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy-notice-and-policy/)

**Please tick to confirm you have read and understood the privacy notice** .....

