



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 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: Grantham Canal Society (Registered Charity Number: 507337)

Organisation: Grantham Canal Society

Address:

Canal Depot

(Rear of The Duck at Woolsthorpe Pub)

Duck Lane

Woolsthorpe by Belvoir

Postcode: NG32 1NY

E-Mail Address:

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

Name: Anthony Goody (Finance Manager/Chairman elect, Grantham Canal Society)

Organisation: Grantham Canal Society

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).

These comments are made on behalf of Grantham Canal Society, the charity for the restoration, maintenance and promotion of the use of the Grantham Canal running from Nottingham to Grantham. We make comment on the draft supplementary planning document in respect of the impact on the canal and its use. We do not make comment on the housing policy aspects as we feel that this is beyond our remit.

- 1) We note in section 1.5 on page 5 the statement "*Once built, it will create a new neighbourhood within Rushcliffe, and it is thus important for the Council and developers of the site to ensure this meets the highest possible standard*"; we agree with this sentiment and urge that the document and policy be amended to apply this principle to providing high quality and safe access for pedestrians, cyclists and other non-motorised users to and from the development underneath the A52 using the canal corridor. The canal has huge potential to provide an inviting route integrating with existing access into Gamston, West Bridgford and Nottingham, and in addition it can provide a traffic free means for people to travel, avoiding an unpleasant crossing of the busy A52 road. An amendment to the development framework to reinstate the canal and towpath under the A52 would provide the highest possible standard of active travel opportunities both for new residents of the development and residents of the wider area. It is an opportunity to ensure there is some benefit to people in the surrounding area, by enabling easier and safer access to local countryside. Safe access underneath the A52 will help mitigate the risks of congestion, accidents, injuries and deaths that will exist with use of at grade pedestrian crossings as the only means of crossing the A52.
- 2) We note that section 1.8 on page 6 describes the SPD as setting out "The strategic infrastructure needed to facilitate the new development" and "The necessary transport including active travel routes and streets", and "The areas of green and blue infrastructure". We urge that the document is amended to explicitly include reinstatement of the Grantham Canal underneath the A52 as a necessary active travel route and piece of strategic infrastructure to facilitate the new development. This would also secure the future of the Grantham Canal as an attractive key piece of local green and blue infrastructure.
- 3) We note the site location plan on page 7 shows the allocated site with the A52 to the west, and the Grantham Canal to the north of the site running across from Gamston and the conurbation of Nottingham towards Cotgrave, Cropwell Bishop and beyond. The A52 presents a serious barrier to active travel; both to and from the proposed development and also for residents of Gamston and Cotgrave. The Grantham Canal is a valuable piece of blue/green infrastructure that can help solve this problem.
- 4) Section 1.11 refers to the SPD being developed having regard to statutory bodies and landowners, but does not refer to the Canal and Rivers Trust (the organisation which owns the Grantham Canal). We feel that it is important that the SPD has regard for the needs of the Canal and Rivers Trust (CRT) and funds that will be required to protect the ecology and setting of the canal and ensure it is able to handle increased usage that the development will bring.
- 5) On Page 10 it is stated that "The development shall be appropriately phased to take into account provision of necessary infrastructure, including improvements to the highway along the A52(T) and public transport network". This should be amended to state "The development shall be appropriately phased to take into account provision of necessary infrastructure, including improvements to the highway along the A52(T), the Grantham Canal and the public transport network."

6) On page 10 within Section D “Transportation” the document states requirements for improvements to road infrastructure to mitigate adverse traffic impacts; improvements to walking, cycling and public transport links through and beyond the site; a financial contribution to improvements to the A52. We comment that the SPD needs to be amended to include improvements to the Grantham Canal and towpath (including reinstatement under the A52) and financial contributions to this. Such improvements to the canal would make a compelling contribution to: (i) increasing and encouraging active travel to/from the site and surrounding areas; (ii) mitigating adverse traffic impacts by reducing car use/providing an alternative means of travel to and from nearby facilities and employment locations; (iii) reducing the impact of the development on the A52 by providing non-motorised access across the A52 without requiring traffic to stop at traffic lights (with associated congestion, noise and pollution).

7) We support the statement on page 11 (F. Other Requirements, section 17) “An enhanced Green corridor should also be created along the Grantham Canal”, but urge that this enhanced green corridor must include reinstatement of the canal and towpath under the A52. This will help mitigate the impacts of development and provide a lasting positive legacy for the community.

8) We note that the key to the figure/map on page 11 refers to the Widening/upgrade to 2 lane dual carriageway of the A52. Such an upgrade will make the A52 even more of a barrier to active travel East-West and will deter cyclists, pedestrians and other non-motorised travel. This is another reason why the reinstatement of the Grantham Canal and towpath under the A52 should be included as an integral part of the SPD.

9) We also note that the figure/map on page 11 shows/implies that there will be removal of access to Tollerton Lane from the A52. Whilst we understand that this may be sensible to manage traffic access and impacts, we are concerned that this will further reduce access to the Grantham Canal and the route it provides into the countryside for users from Gamston and West Bridgford. Currently there is a small car park on Tollerton Lane adjacent to the canal which enables users to park and then make use of the canal. The SPD needs to be amended to mitigate this loss/reduction in access. This could be achieved by reinstating the Canal and towpath under the A52. Additionally we urge that the Grantham Canal be utilised as a primary access to the site, with the towpath providing an excellent active travel route.

10) Page 13 includes a summary of the “Building for a Healthy Life” document. “This document provides guidance to creating places that are better for people and nature” and specifically includes the statement that “Pedestrian and cycle routes to key destinations should be direct and segregated from general traffic”. We urge that the SPD needs to have greater regard for this guidance and should explicitly adhere to this guidance by including reinstatement of the Grantham Canal and towpath under the A52 as a Pedestrian and Cycle route segregated from the most significant traffic threat in the vicinity of the site.

11) Page 15 summarises the Vision for the Site and includes the sentences “Place-making is at the centre of the vision for the development.”, and “The objective is to move away from bland vehicular led ‘non-descript housing estates’ and to deliver an attractive enduring place”. We urge that the SPD must be strengthened to meet these objectives by explicitly requiring the reinstatement of the Grantham Canal and towpath under the A52 – this will provide an enduring legacy for the community and mitigate the high risk that the development would be highly car dependent due to the barrier and danger of the A52.

12) Section 2.7 on page 16 refers to cycle routes; green/blue infrastructure; recreational routes for walking; cycling and running; We urge that the SPD is amended to more clearly align with policy on achieving well-designed places and sustainable urban design. Integrating a reinstated Grantham Canal and towpath under the A52 will do this. In addition this will contribute to meeting the requirement for a biodiversity net gain by improving the canal as a green corridor for wildlife and aquatic species. A reinstated canal under the A52 will protect and enhance the canal as a corridor for species to move in the vicinity of the site.

13) Page 17, section 2.16 refers to Securing Infrastructure Requirements and section 106 agreements. We urge that section 106 agreements are used to enable enhancement and protection of the Grantham Canal and its amenity and ecological value.

14) Figure 6 on page 23 is inadequate as the map does not include the Grantham Canal despite inclusion of a picture of the canal directly underneath and the canal being significant to the context of the site.

15) We welcome reference in section 3.9 on page 25 to policy 25 which “requires an enhanced Green corridor to be created along the Grantham Canal.”. This should be strengthened to include reinstatement of the canal and towpath under the A52.

16) Page 33 refers to cycling and walking connectivity and rightly identifies the Towpath of the Grantham Canal as a well established route. The SPD should be amended to recognise the significant value that can be realised by reinstating the canal and towpath underneath the A52. This would provide the missing link for safe access East-West for non-motorised travel and enable onward access to Nottingham City Centre via the new bridge over the Trent. Additionally this would significantly enhance the network for non-motorised travel across the wider area.

17) Page 35 correctly identifies the facilities in Gamston, West Bridgford and Nottingham City Centre, but no safe and traffic free method for travel to and from them (or for people to access new facilities in the new development). The SPD needs to include the reinstatement of the Grantham Canal and towpath underneath the A52 to solve this problem and meet the need for people to travel to and from the new development.

18) We welcome the references in section 3.64 to connections to the Grantham Canal for walking and cycling. The benefit of the Grantham Canal will be maximised by providing cohesive connectivity to Gamston, West Bridgford and Nottingham City Centre via a reinstated canal and towpath underneath the A52

19) Figure 20 on page 41 shows the Site Opportunities plan and correctly identifies the route of the Grantham Canal as a Pedestrian/Cycle Route via a dashed purple line running across the A52. We don't want people to need to run across the A52! Avoid this by reinstating the canal and towpath on the existing alignment underneath the A52 to provide a safe and traffic free route for active travel.

20) Figure 20 on page 41 shows access points to the site. However, it is disappointing and inadequate that these have been conceived in a car centric way and refer to road access only.

21) Section 4.5 on page 43 includes the following Design Objectives: To integrate the new neighbourhood with the built-up part of Nottingham/Gamston; To deliver a sustainable and environmentally responsible development.; To develop and enhance the site's natural assets, such as Grantham Canal, whilst delivering ecological enhancements.; To respect the surrounding landscape and provide new green infrastructure, including achieving policy objectives; Deliver health and well-being benefits for the proposed and nearby residents. Achievement of these Design objectives will be enhanced greatly by reinstatement of the Canal and towpath underneath the A52.

22) Page 44 includes reference to an East-West Greenway and linking Gamston to the site via Public rights of way. The Grantham Canal can be a major integral part of such a Greenway and provide a safe and attractive way of linking the new development and Gamston together via a reinstated towpath and canal underneath the A52. This is a far more usable, effective and sustainable solution than expecting people to cross the A52 at grade via pedestrian crossings. Providing a route that channels people away from conflict with busy traffic will avoid casualties and reduce congestion.

23) Page 45 includes many references to linear parks, cycle and walking routes etc and access to the A52 for traffic, but fails to address the need to provide safe non-motorised travel routes across the A52. This is inadequate. The cycle and pedestrian facilities need to include safe access from the site to existing facilities in Gamston and West Bridgford, and also from those areas to new facilities within the development site. The SPD needs to be amended to link non-motorised travel routes within the

development site to the routes that will allow safe onward travel. This includes a need for the towpath and canal to be reinstated underneath the A52.

- 24) We welcome the following statements on page 52: "Providing good pedestrian and cycle connectivity for new and existing residents through delivery of green corridors which connect the existing urban edge to nearby Gamston as well as to the surrounding countryside." And "Connectivity - this includes the requirement to create an additional network of footpaths through the site to link and connect to the wider area, and attractive recreational routes and/or leisure routes to facilitate active travel within the site and beyond"; however, this will be inadequate and incomplete without reinstatement of the Grantham Canal and towpath underneath the A52. The SPD needs to be amended to reflect this.
- 25) The connectivity described on page 59 is incomplete and inadequate without a safe traffic free means to get from one side of the A52 to the other. The reinstatement of the canal and towpath can deliver this.
- 26) The drainage strategy referred to on page 63 needs to be clear that any water from the site must not be allowed to drain into the canal in a polluted state.
- 27) We note the following statements in the Movement Framework on page 64: "The primary objective of the proposed Access and Movement strategy (Figure33) is to minimise the need to travel by car, and promote trips by modes other than the car," but feel that this is unlikely to be achieved solely "by providing as many key facilities and social uses (and connections to them) on site as possible". There must be safe provision for non-car journeys to and from facilities off-site, and also for people drawn to the site from elsewhere. Facilities such as schools, sports pitches, doctors etc and the employment locations will draw in people from Gamston and other places. There needs to be provision for safe, attractive traffic free travel for these journey needs. Concentrating on very short journeys within the site and a movement strategy for these is inadequate – there needs to be connectivity offsite if the stated aspiration of 'minimising the need to travel by car and promoting trips by modes other than car' is going to be achieved. The reinstatement of the canal and towpath underneath the A52 can strongly contribute to achieving the stated aspirations
- 28) Figure 35 on page 65 and also Figure 44 on page 77 identify a Grantham Canal Cycle/Bridleway with a dashed yellow line and a proposed leisure trail converging at a point immediately prior to crossing the location of the A52. This has excellent potential, but this potential will only be realised by reinstatement of the canal and towpath underneath the A52. People are likely to be put off by an unpleasant experience of crossing a busy road and being exposed to associated safety risks. Use of a pedestrian crossing at this point would also be likely to be highly disruptive to traffic if ambitions for adoption of car free active travel were to be achieved.
- 29) The Memorandum of Understanding for A52/A606 improvement package and requirements for Developer contributions for improvements referred to in Section 4.71 must be supplemented with an explicit requirement to provide contribution to reinstatement of the Grantham Canal and Towpath underneath the A52. This would significantly assist achievement of other stated objectives to encourage active travel and manage congestion. Pedestrian crossings of a busy dual carriageway are not likely to encourage non-motorised travel, will contribute to congestion by stopping traffic, and will encourage use of less suitable routes at busy times.
- 30) It is noted that there is a picture of children cycling on page 69. Is it likely that parents and carers will be happy with their youngsters cycling independently across a busy dual carriageway? Cycling and other active travel is only likely to be maximised by safe provision of traffic free means of crossing the A52.
- 31) The "Sustainable Transport Strategy" on page 70 and 71 is currently incomplete and requires amendment. In particular achieving the aims of the "Copenhagenize" work to create "more bicycle-friendly urban environments through thoughtful infrastructure, planning, and design." is unlikely without providing traffic free safe travel to the other side of the A52. Reinstatement of the Canal and Towpath underneath the A52 and integration into on site travel routes would be "more bicycle friendly", be

“thoughtful infrastructure, planning and design”, be an action that “encourages people to choose sustainable and active modes of transport, ultimately fostering healthier communities and environments.”, and “minimise conflicts between vulnerable road users and motor vehicles”.

- 32) We note the statement in 4.87 on page 74 “provision of an extensive network of pedestrian and cycle routes linking to existing off site routes and Public Right of Ways to promote active modes of transport and reduce reliance on the car.”. Again this is only likely to be achieved by provision of safe traffic free travel opportunities by reinstatement of the canal and towpath underneath the A52.
- 33) We welcome the following requirement on page 76: “Safer access to and from Gamston, with suitable pedestrian and cycle crossings”, but believe that safe and suitable pedestrian and cycle access can only be delivered by reinstatement of the towpath and canal underneath the A52. Crossings of the A52 will not deliver on this requirement.
- 34) We support the following requirement on page 76 “Grantham Canal (which bounds the site) must be enhanced to facilitate access to and from a new fitness trail to be provided within the site to encourage outdoor activity and mobility whilst also allowing for the enhancement of wildlife habitats and the screening along the boundary to the site.”, but this needs to be amended to require Developer funds to achieve this.
- 35) We note many references to the Grantham Canal in the SPD, and to enable the many associated aspirations to be delivered there will need to be funding for improvements to and maintenance of the canal and towpath. The “Paying for long term stewardship” section on page 79 requires amendment to include contribution to the costs of improving and maintaining the Grantham Canal.
- 36) The “Off-site infrastructure” listed on page 82 needs to be amended to specifically include reinstatement of the Grantham Canal and towpath underneath the A52. This will make a significant contribution to “capacity and safety of pedestrian / cycle infrastructure” and be an “Appropriate measure for, and improvement to, walking, cycling”.
- 37) We are concerned that use of Tollerton Lane for access to the site (referred to on page 83) will deter use of the Grantham Canal and towpath for leisure and active travel. Early action should be taken to resolve this. The SPD should require safe crossing for Canal users at this point. The appropriate solution would be to reinstate the canal and towpath underneath Tollerton Lane in conjunction with reinstatement underneath the A52.
- 38) The Framework Section 106 agreement and Whole site infrastructure table on page 85 are insufficient and incomplete. Early delivery of reinstatement of the canal and towpath underneath the A52 must be included and would be significantly more effective than at-grade crossings that are included.
- 39) The Gamston Link Open Space Character Area referred to within section 3.2 of the Site Wide Design Code is insufficient and needs to be strengthened. This area should be closely associated with a reinstated canal and towpath underneath the A52 and connection to associated active travel routes, rather than being orientated to a busy, unattractive road junction.
- 40) We note that the mobility strategy (section 4.1) “aims to create a permeable, legible and well connected network of routes linking the new development to existing development.”, and “create attractive routes to promote walking, wheeling and cycling as the main modes of travel within the site and connect to its surroundings, maximising opportunities for sustainable mobility. Strategic cycle and pedestrian links will be established alongside first occupations, to influence early-on travel habits.” These aims are best supported by early delivery of safe active travel routes using a reinstated canal and towpath underneath the A52 – the mobility strategy should be amended to reflect this.
- 41) We note Mandatory requirement 6 in section 4.2 Access and Movement “Safe crossing points must be provided at key junctions between roads and footways/cycle ways”. This principle must be applied to

access to the other side of the A52 and include delivery of a reinstated canal and towpath underneath the A52.

42) *The practicalities of getting the Canal and towpath under the A52 are reasonably simple as a reinforced box culvert will do the job quite adequately. The canal is approximately 5m below the road level of the current A52 and as such the alignment of the road level would not be dissimilar from the road level at present. The Box Culvert would include a towpath for active travel use.*

A similar solution was put in place by National Highways on the A38 Whitminster Roundabout in Gloucestershire where the A38 severed the Cotswold canal. It is now functioning as a safe route for walkers, runners and cyclists underneath the busy A38

(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.....YES.....

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/

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