

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

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

05 November 2025

Dear Sir / Madam,

**REPRESENTATIONS TO EAST OF GAMSTON/NORTH OF TOLLERTON DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SPD
RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF VISTRY HOMES LTD**

These representations are submitted on behalf of our client, Vistry Homes Ltd (hereafter referred to as Vistry), in response to the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document ('SPD') consultation (October-November 2025). The SPD is prepared to facilitate the delivery of the strategic allocation which removed the land from the Green Belt as part of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in 2014 as part of a mixed-use development including 4,000 homes, schools and 20 hectares of employment. The allocation is proposed to be carried forward in the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan ('GNSP').

Vistry own land within the southern part of the allocation and have submitted a hybrid planning application for 1,600 homes on the site (Ref: 24/00347/HYBRID), which in part re-uses brownfield land through the redevelopment of the airfield. A planning application has also been submitted by Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land under application reference: 20/03244/OUT. Vistry have been working positively with Rushcliffe Borough Council, the other landowners and promoters, and wider stakeholders to develop the SPD, adoption of which will supplement the development plan and assist with the delivery of the allocation. Vistry remains committed to delivering much needed homes for the region and so we are supportive of the production and adoption of the SPD, but consider there are aspects for consideration by the Council ahead of progressing the SPD through to adoption.

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.

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, 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 in section 5 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.

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 Vistry.

Yours faithfully

James Bonner
Planning Director