



RE: Planning Applications 25/00371/OUT (outline – up to 420 dwellings) and 25/00928/FUL (Hybrid – 69 dwellings full and 351 dwellings outline)

Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (CTTCNF) is the qualifying body responsible for the preparation of the Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Plan (CTTCNP). The CTTCNP was adopted 'made' by Broxtowe Borough Council in May 2024, covering the period 2020 to 2040. It therefore forms part of the Development Plan (alongside the Local Plan) for the CTTCNF Area within which these two development proposals fall.

CTTCNF is responding to the two applications together as they have been submitted by the same applicant for the same development they are calling Toton "West" and as these applications are clearly interrelated, they should be determined together.

CTTCNF's submitted representations made to the original 25/00371/OUT application and dated 3rd July 2025 remain substantially the same for the current re-consultation of the same application, and are equally applicable to the new 25/00928/FUL (hybrid) application. Since many of the submitted documents are duplicated for both applications, CTTCNF's approach will avoid further duplication.

We highlight here in these additional representations issues arising from new and updated documents submitted by the applicant since our original representations were made. For ease of reference CTTCNF's original representations can be viewed via these two links [25-00371-OUT Development West of Stapleford Lane - Covering Letter](#) and [25-00371-OUT Development West of Stapleford Lane - NP Assessment](#) which should be read in conjunction with these additional representations. The original representations also accompany this document.

N.B. 1. Representations made without an application reference number are applicable to both applications. Where representations are specific, then the application reference number is provided.

2. The addendum included at the end of these representations provides updated text for the previously submitted assessment spreadsheet against each of the CTTCNP Policies where they have been discussed within these additional representations.

Development Plan Context and NPPF Compliance

Under paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan comprises:

- The Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan (P2LP)
- The CTTCNP
- Relevant strategic policies within the emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP)

and as a material consideration:

- The Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Masterplan SPD (SM-SPD)

The NPPF (paragraphs 29–30) gives significant weight to neighbourhood plans that are up to date. The CTTCNP was adopted in May 2024 and therefore carries full weight.

This application conflicts with several Development Plan policies, as set out below.

Failure to Consider Cumulative and Strategic Impacts

The applicant presents Toton “West” as a standalone development. This is not credible.

The site forms part of the Toton Strategic Location for Growth (SLG) and is functionally linked to:

- Toton “East” (25/00255/FUL)
- Toton “North” (25/00306/OUT)
- Development at Chetwynd Barracks

The applicant’s own combined site plan demonstrates interrelationship.

The NPPF (paragraph 191) requires cumulative impacts to be properly assessed. P2LP Policy 3.2 and GNSP Policy 21 require a coordinated, infrastructure-led and comprehensive approach.

A piecemeal transport and infrastructure assessment is therefore contrary to:

- NPPF paragraphs 108–113 (transport)
- NPPF paragraph 34 (infrastructure planning)
- Development Plan strategic policies for the SLG

A comprehensive traffic modelling and infrastructure study across the entire SLG and Chetwynd Barracks area is required before determination.

Discussion

In several of the documents, but in particular the Transport Assessment, the applicant asserts that the two applications for Toton “West” are for a standalone development to be considered on its own merits. CTTCNP rejects this assertion as clearly the applicant’s two other submitted developments 25/00255/FUL (Toton “East”) and 25-00306-OUT (Toton “North”) within the Strategic Location for Growth are all interlinked as shown by their own [Combined Sites Plan](#).

All these applications also ignore the impact of development at Chetwynd Barracks, and of the land north of this development site (owned by Nottinghamshire County Council). As previously stated, a holistic approach is required and is essential for the whole of the Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Site. The Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Masterplan SPD and Policy 21 of the emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP) require that any development in Chetwynd Barracks (P2LP Policy 3.1) and the Toton Strategic Location for Growth (SLG) (P2LP Policy 3.2) is considered as part of a holistic view, particularly for infrastructure changes (roads, public transport, healthcare, education, services & facilities, etc.).

The CTTCNP requires a holistic approach and therefore piecemeal proposals for development in this location are unacceptable and must be rejected.

Nottingham Express Transit (NET) Tram Extension

An indicative route for the extension of the Nottingham Express Transit (NET) tram line to the west of its current terminus at Toton Lane has now been included within the Parameter Plan. Compliance with CTTCNP Policies INF03 (1) and URB05 (1) has now been achieved. However, the impact of another signal-controlled junction on

the B6003 has not been included within the Transport Assessment (see below), and the exact location for the Toton transport interchange is still to be determined by stakeholders.

Affordable Housing

The hybrid application seeks full permission for 69 dwellings with **no affordable housing provision**.

This conflicts with:

- Broxtowe P2LP affordable housing policy (30%)
- CTCNP Policy HAS01
- NPPF paragraphs 63–66 (meeting affordable housing need)

Affordable housing should be provided on-site and integrated (“pepper-potted”) to promote mixed and balanced communities (NPPF paragraph 65).

The applicant argues the first phase must fund the junction works. However:

- The junction serves Toton “East” and Toton “North” as well
- Infrastructure costs cannot justify zero provision without a robust viability assessment
- No evidence has been submitted demonstrating non-viability

If later phases do not proceed, the development would deliver **zero affordable housing**, contrary to policy. The current proposal is therefore non-compliant.

Discussion

The hybrid application 25/00928/FUL seeks full approval for 69 dwellings (three- and four-bedroom homes) in the initial phase of development without providing any affordable housing. This is unacceptable as the requirement for 30% affordable housing within the CTCNP, Broxtowe’s Part 2 Local Plan (P2LP) and NPPF Policy 5 applies to all major development, and should be built out as part of the development to avoid ghettoisation. In other words, affordable homes should be ‘pepper potted’ throughout the development to avoid clustering, and it also provides a mixture of tenure across the site.

What if, for example, the remaining 351 dwellings are not built, then there will be no affordable housing within Toton “West”!

The argument provided by the applicant is that these initial 69 dwellings (without affordable housing) will fund the new four-way junction access on to the B6003 Stapleford Lane. This new junction of course will also provide access to the applicant’s Toton “East” development proposal 25/00255/FUL for 155 dwellings (including 30% affordable housing) and access for the 880 homes proposed in 25/00306/OUT (Toton “North”).

It is therefore disingenuous to suggest that the Toton “East” full application will not contribute to the cost of building the junction, along with the applicant’s third proposal for Toton “North” 25/00306/OUT for 880 dwellings (including affordable housing) that will also access the B6003 via the same junction, together with the contribution from the remaining 351 dwellings proposed for Toton “West”.

Therefore, this argument should be rejected and the 30% requirement for affordable housing must be included within the initial phase of development for 69 dwellings.

Housing Mix and Local Need

The 69 dwelling phase comprises predominantly three- and four-bedroom dwellings.

The CTTCNP evidence base identifies an over-supply of larger dwellings in Toton and a need for smaller and more affordable homes.

The proposal fails to:

- Reflect local housing need
- Demonstrate compliance with CTTCNP Policy HAS01
- Deliver a balanced mix as required by NPPF paragraph 62

Discussion

As stated within the CTTCNP (Policy HAS01) there is a higher percentage of three, and especially four or more, bedroom houses within the Forum Area, which is particularly the case in Toton. Therefore, this part of the hybrid application doesn't address the local housing needs and should be rejected.

Housing Design Quality and Character

The submitted house types appear to be standardised products lacking site-specific character.

This conflicts with:

- NPPF paragraphs 131–134 (good design)
- CTTCNP Urban Design policies
- The requirement to create locally distinctive development

There is no meaningful reference to:

- Building for a Healthy Life
- Modern Methods of Construction (as required by CTTCNP Policy HAS04)
- Distinctive placemaking

The application does not currently demonstrate policy-compliant design quality.

Discussion

The housing designs submitted as part of the hybrid application 25/00928/FUL appear to be standard 'off the shelf' designs and much like other developments in the wider locality i.e. they are not innovative nor provide any sense of character or distinctiveness for the development site.

Our previous representation submitted against 25/00371/OUT deal with Urban Design with respect to Building for a Healthy Life and BREEAM Communities, and included a number of recommendations for improvement. It is therefore disappointing that these have not been considered within the new and updated applications.

The housing designs also appear to be of traditional construction with no consideration of Modern Methods of Construction as required by CTTCNP Policy HAS04 that would minimise the on-site construction build out time, and reduce the length of disturbance for the local community.

Both applications should be rejected at this stage until these issues have been addressed.

Environment, Landscape, Green Infrastructure and Cables Corridor

The high voltage cable easement (10m corridor) is now defined. This presents an opportunity for:

- Green infrastructure connectivity
- Active travel route integration

However, the applications do not clearly demonstrate:

- Appropriate corridor width for biodiversity
- Integration into a coherent green infrastructure network
- Compliance with NPPF paragraph 180 (biodiversity and net gain)

Further detail is required at outline stage to ensure strategic green connectivity is secured.

Landscape and Design

Consideration needs to be given to planting larger species of trees, and in particular for street trees, ensure that there are appropriate growing conditions. Street trees are shown only on the primary street; appropriate species of trees should be used on all streets and within some gardens. The number of trees shown on drawings should be planted, but their positions need to be realistic.

The largest tree girths are proposed at 12-14cm; this is too small and 16-18cm should be used on principal routes; with 14-16cm on other routes. Larger trees could be used on the northern boundary rather than Sorbus species.

There are no specific details about meadow planting within the landscape specification drawing. A depth of 150mm is too deep for a wildflower meadow, and also need to ensure that topsoil is limited before planting to discourage more competitive grasses.

Green spaces and pocket parks along roads need to be carefully designed to create positive spaces.

Front garden boundaries need to be defined, and ensure that trees in front gardens are retained/protected by residents.

The road along the southern site boundary edge would lead to loss of ecological consistency.

There is insufficient detail currently, but in the more detailed design there is a need to ensure that parking is not all to the front of houses to avoid creating unpleasant streets, and should also look for opportunities to turn some houses at right angles to provide interest.

As previously suggested, CTCNF would welcome a design review and would wish to be party to that discussion. Both applications should be rejected at this stage until this has been addressed.

Flooding and Drainage

SuDS and Biodiversity

Many of the points below have the potential to be improved, particularly through detailed design by landscape architects used to working with SuDS features. Opportunities to drain at grade from highways into adjacent soft land and green areas do not appear to have been considered.

The ponds illustrated appear to have the same slopes all around; ideally varied slopes provide for greater ecological potential. Sections through the ponds should be provided. The BNG report also supports this approach, but is not shown in the engineers' drawings. The area to the northwest of the lower pond is totally wasted and inaccessible land.

The pond to the north offers opportunities for more imaginative regrading of the land. The kidney shape could equally be a mirror image of that proposed, and the slopes graded out to maximise land for public open space.

Tree pits should be domed (slightly mounded/raised) at the surface rather than flat to allow for water to drain away, with the base of the pit broken up to prevent waterlogging and encourage root growth.

Details of headwalls are required. The opportunity should be taken to design headwalls that blend into the landscape. Railings around headwalls should be avoided to prevent dangerous play features!

It is unclear how existing ditches will be retained and enhanced, and how the ends of the culverted section will be treated. Further details are needed.

The location of the proposed foul water pumping station is dominant in the open space. It could be located to the northeast of the open space, tucked against a boundary to limit its impact.

There is insufficient information to show how SuDS are used throughout the development. The whole drainage system is reliant on a basin at the end of the system. Although this could also be used for play, a lot more information is needed, particularly as these areas will not be directly overlooked.

There are opportunities within the development to do more, such as permeable paved parking areas, using pocket parks and verges for temporary water retention, etc.

Both applications should be rejected at this stage until these issues have been addressed.

Areas for Play

There are insufficient areas for play throughout the development, with only one LEAP at a distance from the majority of dwellings, and not sufficiently overlooked. There are two small pocket parks within the built-up area of the site, but this is insufficient to serve 420 dwellings, particularly as these are likely to be mainly used for dog walking and fouling.

Consideration needs to be given to increase the space for, and number of, play areas i.e. LEAPs and LAPs suitable for children and teenagers of all ages.

Both applications should be rejected at this stage until this has been addressed.

Environment

Wildlife Corridors

Figure 21 of the Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SM-SPD) indicates a wildlife corridor running along the south side of the development adjacent to the existing residential area. It also describes wildlife corridors in para 3.46 as “varied environments with natural drainage capacity and high biodiversity and ecological value that create natural links between existing and new green infrastructure assets and communities. In some locations, they may include existing or new woodland. Where appropriate, wildlife corridors should be designed to include both public space within and private space adjacent to the corridor”.

There is no mention of this corridor in any of the Ecological Assessments other than to preserve the existing hedge line and/or trees at the most south-easterly tip of the development. The intention to underground electricity cables along this corridor would indicate that a 6m width (3m either side of the cables) easement will be required and that within this zone, there should be little or no shrub or tree cover. In the Illustrative Masterplan, this line is shown as a pedestrian link.

The Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) indicates a wooded area within the development as an ACB (area that could become of particular importance for its wildlife value). It would

seem appropriate, therefore, to combine the expertise demonstrated in the LNRS with the desire for a wildlife corridor in the SM-SPD and create a substantial Wildlife Corridor along this southern edge using a combination of trees, shrubs and wildflower planting as well as a pedestrian and possible cycleway for residents. This would be in keeping with CTCNP Policy ENV03 2A (Blue and Green Infrastructure Requirements). No reference to wildlife corridors has been found within the planning application.

Gardens are again referenced as being additional to the wildlife value of the site both for foraging bats and as nectar sources. Gardens are not long-term sustainable sources of green space for wildlife as they cannot be managed by external agencies, and as such should not be included as residents are able to do what they want with their gardens.

Effects on Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and Local Nature Reserves (LNR)

Within the Ecological Assessments, visitors to the adjacent LNR and LWSs are assumed to remain on the surfaced and designated rights of way and thus have a negligible effect on the quality of this green space. Observation of visitor behaviour would reveal the extensive use of off-path areas by both visitors and their dogs, and occasionally horses. This development in isolation may have little impact on these green spaces, but the combined effect of all new developments in the Area will. A holistic approach to the impact of visitor pressure, both here and at Attenborough Nature Reserve, which includes a SSSI, should always be taken.

In addition, as the River Erewash is the only source of water for Attenborough Gravel Pits SSSI, it is of concern that the only attempt to mitigate the loss of permeable surfaces are peripheral SuDS and the supply of water butts. Permeable surfaces and swales have been placed in reserved matters. The impact of increased run-off of nutrient rich water into the River Erewash may have major effects on the already eutrophic water of the Reserve. A holistic approach to these developments would determine the actual impact of the overall increase in impermeable surfaces.

Use of Native Species for Planting

The Ecological Appraisal suggests that only native species should be used in planting. However, the Planting Schedule lists a large number of non-native trees, shrubs and perennials including a species of Rhododendron as part of the Site design. This needs to be clarified as planting non-native species as well as cultivars does not fit with the aspirations of the CTCNP. Planting cultivars, which have the potential to hybridise with native species, close to the LWSs and LNR should be reconsidered.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

Paragraph 6.5 of the Biodiversity Impact Assessment suggests some offsite provision to meet the BNG requirements. A core objective of Policy ENV01 of the CTCNP is to “enrich the biodiversity of the Neighbourhood Area”, this could be achieved with a wildlife corridor of appropriate width at the southern edge of the development i.e. on-site. To reiterate from our previous representations, CTCNF does not support off-site provision of BNG.

Both applications should be rejected at this stage until all the environmental issues have been addressed.

Transport Strategy – Fundamental Concerns

Flawed Modal Shift Assumptions

The Transport Assessment prioritises a shift from petrol/diesel vehicles to electric vehicles. This does not address congestion.

NPPF paragraph 110 requires developments to:

- Promote sustainable transport modes
- Reduce reliance on the private car

Managing travel demand (GNSP Policy 14) is not adequately addressed.

Discussion

Part of the vision as stated in the Transport Assessment is flawed in that it seeks to switch private car journeys from internal combustion engine vehicles to electric vehicles. Whilst this is helpful from a sustainability perspective, it will do nothing to reduce traffic congestion since electric vehicles contribute to, and are affected by, congestion just the same as any other motorised vehicle.

What it should be concentrating on is reducing travel demand for private cars no matter how they are powered. Managing Travel Demand is covered by Policy 14 of the emerging Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP) and has not been referred to in this Transport Assessment. Neither is the East Midlands Combined County Authority (EMCCA) Transport Plan considered as part of this assessment.

Further, within the policy review section of the Transport assessment, there is the absence of any reference to the CTTCNP, which considering it forms part of the Development Plan, is a significant oversight and lacks respect for the Forum.

Topography and “20-Minute Neighbourhood”

The site lies at elevated topography, with most services downhill.

The Transport Assessment’s assertion that amenities are within walking distance contradicts its own data tables.

The assumptions do not adequately reflect:

- Topography
- Demographic variation
- Realistic behaviour patterns

Discussion

Para 2.4.3 of the Transport Assessment describes an overarching mobility strategy defined as “the low carbon 20-minute neighbourhood”. Whilst this may be fine in principle on the flat, in reality with Toton “West” at the top of a steep hill and most services at the bottom this is not going to reduce car journeys for the weekly shop or school drop off as just two examples. One wonders therefore if Mode Transport Planning have assessed the local topography, especially as how far someone can walk in 20 minutes depends on age and fitness as well as gradient.

Further to this, Table 4.2 shows that most amenities fall outside a 20-minute walk of the site. Ignoring this fact, Mode Transport Planning conclude in para 4.4.21 “the site is located within an appropriate walking or cycling distance of a range of educational, leisure and retail facilities.”!

Public Transport Limitations

Current bus services are limited in frequency and hours of operation. Rail accessibility is poor. Tram access is primarily used via park-and-ride, often requiring car journeys.

Modal share data confirms car dominance (~74%).

Without secured improvements to bus frequency, routing and integration, the predicted modal shift is unrealistic.

Discussion

Whilst the Toton NET tram terminus is within walking & cycling distance of the Toton “West” site, that is not the case for most of Toton. Therefore, many people drive to it in order to take the tram. This does not seem to have been factored into the assessment.

Furthermore, the reliability of the tram network cannot be guaranteed. From the start of 2026 to 19th February NET had cancelled at least 136 trams - see [here](#).

Some bus stops are within walking distance of the site, but the bus services in Toton are poor and there is little incentive to use them as the routes are circuitous and slow. Route 536 only runs five buses a day (09:40 to 14:40) with no Sunday service, and route 510 operates hourly (~07:40 to 18:30) again with no Sunday service (table 4.3). No assessment has been made of the occupancy and usage of these two routes to and from Toton within the assessment. A broad bus usage without specifying routes is stated as under 8% for journeys to work in table 6.2, but this compares to almost 74% for car travel. A modal shift away from cars to buses seems a long way off without a significant improvement in bus services for Toton, and therefore car journeys will remain the predominant method of travel for the foreseeable future, especially as no local employment is included within the applicant’s three submitted proposals.

As part of CTTCNF’s [representations](#) to the EMCCA Transport Plan consultation we suggested that the NET Toton Park and Ride site should form the interchange for public transport in the area, with frequent short haul buses from Stapleford, Sandiacre and Long Eaton connecting through it to widen the car free catchment area of the NET, and would also benefit from having improved active travel links to it east and west.

The Forum further suggested that the interchange could form the start/end point for buses to and from Derby and other cities to reduce traffic along the A52 in and out of Nottingham without impacting travel time on those journeys.

Nothing similar has been put forward by Mode Transport Planning in their transport assessment to reduce private car journeys.

Attenborough train station is the nearest railway station to the site, but is at least a 46-minute walk from the site (para 4.5.8). A 2% share of journeys to work (table 6.2) confirms that it is not a realistic option for commuting to and from Toton. That may change when and if a regional hub station is built at Toton, west of this site, but that is far from certain. Therefore, a modal shift to rail travel can be ruled out in the medium to long-term for commuting, again leaving the car as the predominant method.

Parking Strategy

The layout suggests provision for multiple vehicles per dwelling. If genuine modal shift is sought, parking standards and design should reflect restraint and sustainable travel objectives.

Discussion

25/00928/FUL indicates on plot parking and separate garages, which would indicate more than one vehicle per dwelling. For a modal shift away from private car usage then single vehicle parking per dwelling should be considered under reserved matters.

Cumulative Highways Impact

The three linked applications total 1,455 dwellings, with the wider SLG and Chetwynd Barracks allocation between 4,500–4,800 dwellings.

The assessment does not:

- Model full cumulative growth
- Include future junction configurations
- Consider potential NET extension signalised junction impacts
- Fully assess A52 strategic implications

Under NPPF paragraph 111, development should only be refused on highways grounds where impacts are severe. However, that judgment must be based on robust modelling of full cumulative growth.

The current assessment does not provide this.

Discussion

The applicant's three submitted proposals will result in 1,455 dwellings in total, all using the local road network. At a conservative estimate this would increase the number of cars in the Area by 2,000. This does not seem to have been factored into the transport assessment, especially as the impact of Toton "North" has been left out of the assessment (para 7.3.6), and the impact of Toton "East" on the site access junction has also been excluded (para 7.6.7). A theoretical figure of 282 dwellings (para 7.3.7) on the land north of this development site (owned by Nottinghamshire County Council) has been included, but the total number of new dwellings allocated for the entire SLG and Chetwynd Barracks is between 4,500 (P2LP) and 4,800 (GNSP) which has not been considered.

The junctions assessed (M1 junction 25; Bardills island; Bramcote island; B6003 NET park and ride junction; and the B6003/Swiney Way/Banks Road junction) all show they are and will be over capacity at peak periods into the future up to 2041 from the Practical Reserve Capacity (PRC) figures presented in the assessment.

M1 Junction 25 - is over capacity at baseline and progressively gets worse in all scenarios up to 2041. Yet Mode Transport Planning conclude the impact is minimal!

Bardills island - is over capacity at baseline and progressively gets worse in all scenarios up to 2041. Mitigation measures are considered necessary by Mode Transport Planning. The mitigation measures put forward by Mode Transport Planning show some limited improvement in the PRC figures, but demonstrates that the island is still operating over capacity up to 2041. Therefore, the mitigation proposed is insufficient to address the identified capacity issues just from the impact of the Toton "West" development.

Bramcote island - is under capacity at baseline, but capacity reduces over time and is over capacity during morning peak hours by 2041 and also during the evening peak hours in the sensitivity scenario. Yet Mode Transport Planning conclude the impact is negligible!

B6003/Swiney Way/Banks Road junction - is over capacity at baseline and progressively gets worse in all scenarios up to 2041. Mitigation measures are considered necessary by Mode Transport Planning. The mitigation measures put forward by Mode Transport Planning show some limited improvement in the PRC figures, but demonstrates that the junction is still operating over capacity up to 2041. Therefore, the mitigation

proposed is insufficient to address the identified capacity issues just from the impact of the Toton “West” development.

B6003 NET park and ride junction - is under capacity at baseline, but capacity reduces over time and is over capacity by 2041 in the sensitivity scenario. Yet Mode Transport Planning conclude the junction will be able to accommodate increased traffic.

The assessment doesn’t include the impact of and on the B6003/A6005 junction; a future tram extension signal controlled junction (despite the indicative route being shown in the Parameter Plan); an access junction for the site north of this development site; nor the potential link roads east and west of Stapleford Lane. Neither does it assess the impact of full development at Chetwynd Barracks and the entire Toton SLG. The transport assessment therefore doesn’t present the true future picture for traffic congestion on the B6003 and the wider immediate area and should be rejected.

As stated in CTTCNF’s earlier representations, it requires a full independent traffic assessment and modelling to be carried out for the whole of the Toton SLG and Chetwynd Barracks developments (as required by P2LP Policy 3.2 A (viii)), including the link roads, with all new junctions fully assessed for the overall impact of all the developments on all roads. This assessment should also determine the most suitable route and location for the two proposed link roads (east and west of the B6003), as well as the layout and design of all new junctions including mitigation measures required to ensure sufficient capacity at all junctions up to 2041.

CTTCNF also proposed a potential reconfiguration of Bardill's island in its earlier representations (and elsewhere) to mitigate the increased traffic from the whole of the strategic site. This proposal would allow prioritisation of through traffic along the A52 to and from Derby and M1 junction 25, with grade separation for local traffic away from the A52, perhaps by use of a flyover over Bardill's island to keep the A52 traffic flowing in both directions (similar to the A52 flyover above Dunkirk island). Grade separation may be possible with the release/allocation of the 20 hectares of land at Toton Northeast (proposed to be released from the green belt by the draft GNSP). This should be included within the independent traffic assessment and modelling (as per above) to assess both feasibility and impact on junction capacity.

The independent traffic assessment should also assess the impact on B6003 traffic during construction of the new access junction for Toton “West” and Toton “East”.

Both applications should be rejected as the overall Transport Strategy is flawed.

Construction Traffic Impact

The Environmental Statements for both applications indicate that “all construction traffic would be routed via the B6003 and A52 and as such the addition of construction traffic along these routes would result in less than a 10% increase, which is considered a negligible impact”, as summarised in para 4.40 to the Planning Statement Addendum to 25/00371/OUT.

CTTCNF disputes that the impact would be negligible and this should also be factored into the independent traffic assessment. In particular, the risk to pedestrians and other road users should be fully assessed. Especially as the applicant considers this to be “below the threshold which requires further assessment”.

CTTCNF would prefer that one or both proposed link roads are used for construction traffic to keep it off the B6003.

Both applications should be rejected until this is resolved.

Conclusion

CTTCNF objects to applications 25/00371/OUT and 25/00928/FUL for the following principal reasons:

1. Failure to consider cumulative and strategic impacts across the SLG and Chetwynd Barracks
2. Non-compliance with affordable housing policy
3. Failure to reflect local housing need
4. Insufficient design quality and local distinctiveness
5. Failure to address environmental and landscaping concerns, including flood risk
6. Inadequate transport modelling and unrealistic modal assumptions
7. Conflict with the statutory Development Plan, including the CTTCNP as set-out within our representations and in the accompanying assessment against the CTTCNP policies.

Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, these applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan. As currently submitted, they do not comply.

CTTCNF would welcome constructive engagement with the applicant and the Local Planning Authority to address these deficiencies through a comprehensive, policy-led approach, including any reserved matters discussions.

These representations have been submitted on behalf of the Chetwynd: The Toton & Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum

Date 24th February 2026

Addendum

This addendum provides updated text for the previously submitted assessment spreadsheet against each of the CTCNP Policies [25-00371-OUT Development West of Stapleford Lane - NP Assessment](#). The addendum and the original should be read in conjunction with each other.

CTTC Neighbourhood Plan Policy	Compliance / Comments	RAG Rating
INF03 – Public Transport		
1. The extension of the Nottingham Express Transit (NET) tram line to the west of its current terminus at Toton Lane will be supported.	Compliant: An indicative route is included within the Parameter Plan.	
HAS01 - Housing Mix		
1. In developments of ten homes or more, at least 30% of properties should be 'Affordable', including a mix of 'Affordable to Rent' and 'Affordable to Buy'.	Partially compliant (25/00371/OUT): The proposal includes 30% affordable homes, however it doesn't state whether this will be a mix of affordable to buy and to rent, therefore clarification is required. There is insufficient detail to fully assess compliance of the outline application at this stage.	
	Non-compliant (25/00928/FUL): The full application for 69 dwellings does not include any affordable housing.	
HAS04 - On-Site Construction		
1. Major development [I] should minimise on-site construction times by the use of Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) [I] building techniques, such as Modular Homes as well as other means where appropriate.	Non-compliant: The housing designs submitted for 25/00928/FUL appear to be of traditional construction with no use of MMC to reduce the timescale to complete the development construction. There have been no housing designs submitted to date for 25/00371/OUT.	
URB05 - Strategic Location for Growth, West of Toton Lane		
1. Routes to, and possible location for, the Toton transport interchange must be safeguarded.	Compliant: An indicative route for the NET tram extension is included within the Parameter Plan, and therefore assumed to be safeguarded. The exact location for the Toton transport interchange is still to be determined by stakeholders.	
FORUM ASPIRATION: 7 Relocation of Electricity Substation and Sewage Works		
The Forum would like the development of the SLG to be recognised as a world-class location to live and work. To help achieve this vision, the Forum would like the Electricity Substation to be relocated and all overhead electricity cables placed underground east and west of Toton Lane.	Partially compliant: The existing power lines are intended to be routed underground within the development, but there is no indication as to any necessary enhancements to the electricity substation & the planned battery storage facility that will be in close proximity to the site, nor the implication for the development if the cables can't be placed underground.	