

Nottingham City

land and planning policies

Development Plan Document
Local Plan Part 2



Report of Consultation for the
Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies
Development Plan Document (Local Plan Part 2)
Publication Version
(Draft Regulation 22 Statement)
September 2017



Nottingham
City Council

Quick Guide to the Report of Consultation for the Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document Publication Version of the Land and Planning Policies (LAPP) document (Local Plan Part 2) (see www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan).

Purpose of this document:

The Land and Planning Policies (LAPP) document (Local Plan Part 2) forms part of the Local Plan for Nottingham City along with the [Core Strategy](#) which guides future development in Nottingham City. The Local Plan Part 2 contains development management policies against which planning applications will be determined and site allocations for future development.

In accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, this Report of Consultation document details the consultation processes undertaken, and summarises comments made by interested parties during the Publication Version consultation stage of the plan and a subsequent Additional Site consultation.

Contents Page

1	Introduction.....	5
2	Plan Preparation Stages.....	5
3	When and how did we consult?	6
4	Consultation at Publication Stage.....	13
5	Duty to Co-operate	13
6	What comments have been made and how have they been used?	15
7	Publication Version - Summary of Key Issues and how they have been taken into account	16
8	What happens next and where can I find more information?.....	17

Appendices

Appendix A – Summary of Representations by Policy and Site	18
Appendix B – Late responses	228
Appendix C – List of those invited to comment at Publication Stage	230
Appendix D – List of Respondents at Publication Stage	256
Appendix E –Typical Consultation Letter, Statement of Availability of Documents and Guidance Note	261

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CONI	Centre of Neighbourhood Importance
EA	Environment Agency
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
GI	Green Infrastructure
HMO	Houses in Multiple Occupation
LAA	Local Aggregates Assessment
LAPP	Land and Planning Policies Document
LGS	Local Geological Site
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
MSA	Minerals Safeguarding Area
NET	Nottingham Express Transit (Tram)
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Policy Guidance
PBSA	Purpose Built Student Accommodation
PO	Preferred Option
PSA	Primary Shopping Area
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SINC	Site of Importance for Nature Conservation

SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Nottingham City Council has prepared a new Local Plan for Nottingham which allocates development sites and sets out planning policies in the City. Once adopted, the Local Plan Part 2 will sit alongside the Nottingham City Core Strategy, which is known as Part 1 of the Local Plan. Together, these two documents comprise the Development Plan for the City which will guide development in the City up to 2028.
- 1.2 Preparation of the plan has been informed by consultation undertaken in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This statement has been prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and sets out how the council has complied with the requirements of Regulations 18, 19, 20 and 22.

2 Plan Preparation Stages

- 2.1 As well as on-going dialogue with key stakeholders and statutory bodies, the plan has been informed by consultation at the following key stages:
 - Call for Sites (Consultation on a Call for Sites)
 - Land and Planning Policies: Issues and Options, September 2011
<http://www.nottinghamshireinsight.org.uk/d/95683>
 - Land and Planning Policies: Additional Sites, March 2012
<http://www.nottinghaminsight.org.uk/d/96058>
 - Land and Planning Policies: Preferred Option 2013
[Preferred Option](#)
 - Land and Planning Policies: Publication Version Jan 2016 (the main subject of this document)
<http://documents.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/download/444>
- 2.2 Whilst this report focuses on consultation undertaken for the Publication Version Local Plan, it also summarises the previous stages. Full details of the consultation related to earlier stages are set out in separate reports below (including details of consultation process methods, key issues and consultation responses).
 - Issues & Options and Additional Sites Report of consultation (September 2013):
<http://documents.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/download/2095>
 - Preferred option report of consultation (January 2016):
<http://documents.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/download/446>

3 When and how did we consult?

3.1 Figure 1 sets out a summary of consultation undertaken at each stage of plan preparation. A range of consultation methods have been used including:

- Awareness Raising - through the use of existing networks, such as One Nottingham (a strategic partnership encouraging collaboration across Nottingham) and Invest In Nottingham (a body providing information and support to businesses in Nottingham), drop in sessions at community centres and libraries, information in the Nottingham Arrow (a local magazine distributed to every household), press articles, site notices, web site and social media.
- Direct Mail Outs and Emails – to all specific and general consultees and interested parties on the Local Plan Database, direct mail-outs to neighbours of proposed allocation sites.
- Council and Public meetings – Consultation items at City Council Area Committee meetings, Planning Committee, attendance at community forum meetings and special interest group meetings.
- Infrastructure Planning – on-going general and site specific dialogue with statutory consultees, transport and infrastructure providers on both the Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery plan (<http://documents.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/download/3460>)

3.2 At each stage, information on where consultation documents could be viewed and how to respond were made available to consultees and information and documents provided on line and at deposit points in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and the Planning Regulations.

Figure 1: Summary of Consultation Stages for the Land and Planning Policies Document

Stage /Response	Date	Consultation Methods
Call For Sites	7 June to 19 July 2009	Press Release
<p>Issues & Options and Additional Sites</p> <p><i>Issues & Options</i> <u>780 individual people/organisations responded, providing 1,700 specific representations</u></p> <p><u>Additional Sites</u> <u>106 individual people/organisations responded, providing 198 specific representations</u></p>	<p>26 September to 21 November 2011</p> <p>and 5 March to 30 April 2012</p>	<p>Direct mailings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct mailings were sent, in the form of neighbour notification letters, to those properties surrounding the proposed development sites. The method used for selecting these properties was consistent with that used for consulting on a planning application. • Direct mailings in the form of a letter or an e-mail were sent to all contacts on our Local Development Framework (LDF) consultation database. This included statutory consultees, adjacent authorities, interest/environmental groups and the public. • An item on the consultation was included in the electronic LDF newsletter and sent to approximately 700 email contacts from the LDF database on 8/7/11 (Issues and Options) and 13/3/12 (Additional Sites). <p>Awareness raising:</p> <p>External:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A covering letter, a hard copy of the document, leaflets, and response forms were made available in all the City libraries, as well as the Information Point at Central Library and the City's Joint Service Centres (JSCs). The leaflet also advertised the community drop-in sessions. • Item in the One Nottingham e-bulletin. • Item in the Nottingham NCVS e-bulletin. • Information circulated via other colleagues/organisations email circulation lists – e.g. Nottingham Development Enterprise, Invest in Nottingham newsletter (30/9/11), Nottingham Regeneration Ltd and the City Council's Neighbourhood Management team. • Item on the City Council's Corporate Facebook page. <p>Internal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colleague drop-in session - 30/9/11.

Stage /Response	Date	Consultation Methods
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation advertised on TV screens in Loxley House. <p>Local Press:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Press release published and various articles published in the Nottingham Evening Post. <p>Council Publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article published in the Arrow, a City Council publication delivered to every residential address in the City. <p>Internet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article featured on the City Council's Intranet and website. Electronic response forms available on line (SNAP questionnaire). <p>Loxley House reception:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pop-up banner, leaflets and a copy of document in reception for the duration of the consultation period. <p>Stakeholder engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder and Partner workshop, Nottingham Conference Centre – 17/11/12 <p>Events and meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where appropriate, a pop-up banner and copies of the consultation leaflet were taken to all events and meetings. • Various meetings were attended by members of the team to raise awareness of the consultation. In some cases a report was presented at the meeting where attendance was not possible. Some of these meetings were internal City Council meetings, others were attended by a mixture of both internal and external colleagues, and others were meetings in the community. These were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community drop-in sessions at Clifton Cornerstone, Mary Potter and Central

Stage <u>/Response</u>	Date	Consultation Methods
		<p>Library and Bulwell Library – October 2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basford Community Forum meeting – 12/10/11 (external). ▪ Open and Green Spaces Champions Group meeting (internal/external) - 14/06/11 ▪ City Council Area Committee meetings x 10 (internal/external) – Sept 2011 ▪ Development Control Committee (internal/external) - 19/10/11 ▪ Corporate Leadership Team meeting (internal) – Sept 2011 ▪ Various One Nottingham meetings (internal/external) - Green Theme Partnership (internal/external) - 28/9/11, and reports presented at the Neighbourhood Nottingham Working Group 8/12/11. ▪ Community Equality Forum meeting (internal/external) - 13/9/11 ▪ Labour Group Councillors Briefing (internal) - 25/7/11, in advance of consultation period. ▪ Open Space Forum meeting (internal/external) - 10/10/11 ▪ Local Access Forum meeting (internal/external) - 28/10/11 ▪ Issues and Options Councillor themed workshops (internal x 4) 28/2/12 and 29/2/12 ▪ Several colleague themed (policies and sites) drop-in sessions (internal) ▪ Ward forums/focus Groups (x 3), led by Neighbourhood Management – Basford, Mapperley, Radford and Park Ward – November 2011 ▪ One Nottingham Lunchtime Learning session (internal/external) - 31/10/11 ▪ Councillor drop-in sessions focussing on Additional Sites (internal) – March 2012

Stage /Response	Date	Consultation Methods
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p><u>370 individual people/organisations responded, providing 1,370 specific representations</u></p>	<p>7 October 2013 to 2 December 2013</p> <p>Additional Sites (Prospect Place, Land adjacent to the Portal, Queens Drive). Site notices, letters/e-mail consultation undertaken between 22/08/14 and 03/10/14. Statutory consultees between 17/09/14 and 29/10/14</p>	<p>Direct mailouts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter/email to all contacts in the Local Development Framework Consultation Database including statutory consultees, adjacent authorities, interest/environmental groups and the public. • Neighbour Notification letter to all properties surrounding the newly proposed site allocations that occurred at the Preferred Options Stage. This letter informed residents about the site allocations and how to make comments regarding these. <p>Awareness Raising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan Newsletter sent out to all consultees in the Local Plan Database in May 2014 to inform them of progress on the Local Plan and to advise them when the Preferred Option consultation would take place. • Copy of leaflets and response forms were made available at all the City Council's libraries, as well as the Contact Centre at the Central Library and the City's Joint Service Centres. • Leaflet distributed to community drop-in sessions. • Item in the One Nottingham e-bulletin. • E-bulletin sent via the Equality and Fairness Commission contact list. • Article published in the Arrow, a City Council publication delivered to every residential address in the City. • Article posted on the City Council's Website. • Pop-up banner, leaflets and a copy of the LAPP placed in the Loxley House reception for the duration of the consultation period. • Councillor Drop-In sessions. <p>Events and Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where appropriate, a pop-up banner and copies of the consultation leaflet were taken to all events and meetings.

Stage /Response	Date	Consultation Methods
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various meetings were attended by members of the team to raise awareness of the consultation. Some of these meetings were internal City Council meetings, others were attended by a mixture of both internal and external colleagues, and others were meetings in the community. These were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arboretum, Dunkirk, Lenton, Radford, Park Area committee meeting 20.11.13 ▪ Area 8 Committee 13.11.13 ▪ Area Committee East (ACE) Dales, Mapperley and St Anns 19.11.13 ▪ Basford and Bestwood Area Committee 27.11.13 ▪ Berridge and Sherwood Area Committee 21.11.13 ▪ Bulwell and Bulwell Forest Area Committee 20.11.13 ▪ West Area Committee 20.11.13 ▪ Wollaton East and West and Lenton Abbey Area Committee 11.11.13 ▪ Item at Planning Committee Meeting 13.10.13 ▪ Item at the City Centre Forum Meeting 25.11.13 ▪ Dunkirk and Lenton Partnership Forum Meeting 28.11.13 ▪ Presentation at the Housing Strategic Partnership Meeting 05.11.13 <p>Community Drop-In Sessions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mary Potter Joint Service Centre 09.10.13 ▪ Clifton Cornerstone Joint Service Centre 10.10.13 ▪ Top Valley Community Centre 12.10.13 ▪ Riverside Joint Service Centre 14.10.13 ▪ Sherwood Library 19.10.13 ▪ Wollaton Library 11.11.13 ▪ Item at the Nottingham Action Group Meeting 23.10.13 ▪ Meeting with East Midlands Property Owners 29.10.13 ▪ Students' Unions Presentation 07.10.13 ▪ Item at Local Access Forum Meeting 07.11.13 ▪ Strategic Flood Board presentation 25.11.13 ▪ Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership presentation 25.04.13 ▪ Item at Open Space Champions Group Meeting 22.10.13

Stage /Response	Date	Consultation Methods
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Item at Meadows Partnership Trust Meeting 18.11.13 ▪ Item at Health and Wellbeing Group Meeting 28.10.13
<p>Publication</p> <p><u>164 responses received (including 8 late responses) providing 967 specific responses</u></p> <p>Thane Road additional site</p> <p><u>16 individual people/organisations responded, providing 49 specific responses</u></p>	<p>29 January to 11 March 2016</p> <p>Additional Site (Thane Road) 28 September to 9 November 2016</p> <p>Site notices, letters/e-mail consultation undertaken</p>	<p>Direct mailouts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters/emails to all contacts in the Local Development Framework Consultation Database including statutory consultees, adjacent authorities, interest/environmental groups, the public and businesses. • Where proposed allocations did not already have planning permission, consultation letters were also sent to properties located close to proposed development sites along with site notices with details of the consultation. <p>Consultation with the City Council's Area Committees and Planning Committee as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arboretum, Dunkirk, Lenton, Radford, Park Area committee meeting 17.02.16 • Area 8 Committee 10.02.16 • Area Committee East (ACE) Dales, Mapperley and St Anns 09.02.16 • Basford and Bestwood Area Committee 24.02.16 • Berridge and Sherwood Area Committee 18.02.16 • Bulwell and Bulwell Forest Area Committee 17.02.16 • West Area Committee 02.03.16 • Wollaton East and West and Lenton Abbey Area Committee 08.02.16 • Item at Planning Committee Meeting 17.02.16 • Information provided at Council libraries, deposit points, Loxley House reception and website.

4 Consultation at Publication Stage

- 4.1 A summary of consultation undertaken for the Publication Version between 29 January and 11 March is included within Figure 1. In addition, Appendix E includes a copy of a typical consultation letter, the City Council's Statement of Availability of Documents, and the Council's guidance on how to comment (please see separate documents for information on earlier stages).
- 4.2 At publication stage, consultation on an additional site took place between 28 September and 9 November 2016 following the decision of Imperial Tobacco to close their factory on Thane Road. Given the site's location in an important employment area, the City Council decided to allocate the site for employment use and undertake additional consultation. Details are set out in Figure 1.

5 Duty to Co-operate

- 5.1 Nottingham City Council has sought to positively engage with all the relevant duty to cooperate bodies throughout the preparation of the Part 2 Local Plan, and is confident that it has fully complied with the duty.
- 5.2 Part 2 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 which came into effect on the 6th April 2012, clarifies that the bodies prescribed for the purposes of section 33A (1) (c) of the Localism Act 2011 (in relation to the duty to cooperate) comprise the following:
- Local Planning Authorities, either neighbouring or making up the Housing Market Area
 - Environment Agency
 - Historic England
 - Natural England
 - Mayor of London
 - Civil Aviation Authority
 - Homes and Communities Agency
 - NHS Nottingham City (Primary Care Trust) now replaced by Clinical Commissioning Group
 - Office of the Rail Regulator
 - Highways England
 - Transport for London
 - Integrated Transport Authorities
 - Highway Authorities
 - Marine Management Organisation
 - Local Enterprise Partnerships
 - Local Nature Partnerships
- 5.3 However, some of these prescribed bodies are not relevant to Nottingham City:

- Mayor of London
- Transport for London
- Integrated Transport Authorities
- Marine Management Organisation

5.4 The degree of engagement during the Plan Preparation process has reflected the nature of the issues which have arisen. A close working relationship exists between the City Council and the partner Councils¹ that make up the Greater Nottingham Area. These Councils are all members of the Greater Nottingham Joint Planning advisory Board, which oversaw the preparation of the Aligned Core Strategies, and has an on-going role in discharging the Duty to Cooperate.

5.5 A full Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement will accompany the Submission of the Local Plan and include engagement through the revised Deposit stage. Summaries of Duty to Cooperate bodies can be found in this document, together with a summary of the City Council's response.

5.6 In summary, no outstanding issues of a strategic nature remain outstanding. Two issues had the potential to fall within this definition:

1.) Nottinghamshire County Council

5.7 An issue raised by the County Council concerns the development of site PA82 Freeth Street in the Waterside area (Consulttee 3737 – Repts 4207, 4937, 4938). The County Council's concerns relate to the fact that a Waste Management Facility operated by Viola, who holds the waste contract with the County Council, is located within the PA82 site allocation. The County Council consider the removal of this facility, without a suitable replacement facility, would be prejudicial to the operation of the waste contract, and in their view, contrary to the Joint Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy Policy WCS10 which seeks to safeguard existing waste management facilities.

1)

5.8 The Waterside redevelopment and the site at Freeth Street are longstanding regeneration aspirations of the City Council, initially included in the Waterside Regeneration Planning Guidance (2001), and both being included in the 2005 Local Plan. The concept of the Waterside Regeneration Zone is carried forward into the 2014 Nottingham City Core Strategy. The Viola site itself is critical to achieving the comprehensive redevelopment of the area, particularly because the site abuts the River Trent, and a key aspect of the regeneration plan is a continuous waterside cycling/walking route from Trent Bridge to Colwick Park.

5.9 The City Council would therefore like to secure the relocation of the facility in the medium term to allow the site to be developed for residential led development. A

¹ Ashfield District Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Erewash Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council, Nottingham City Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils.

Supplementary Planning Document is in preparation which will set out more detail in terms of the form and phasing of the development of the Waterside.

5.10 Changes to the Waterside Policy (RE8) are therefore proposed to ensure that new development does not impact on existing operations and to protect the amenity of new residents prior to the relocation of uses which are not compatible with the regeneration aims of the Waterside. In addition, changes to the Development Principles for PA82 are also proposed, to protect the interest of the site's operation in the short term, by including sensitive phasing proposals to developments which could impact on the operation, to allow for the identification of relocation opportunities.

5.11 These changes have been agreed with the County Council, and subject to their inclusion, the County Council have indicated that they are content with the response to their representations.

2) Lowland Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Local Nature Partnership

5.12 No response was received from the NLP to previous consultation versions of the Plan. However, the LNP responded to the Publication version of the Local Plan, highlighting a number of areas where they considered the Plan could be improved. A meeting was subsequently held with LNP representatives to explain and clarify the approach to Sustainability Appraisal and the evidence base, which was where the NLP's concerns were focussed.

5.13 The LNP have subsequently confirmed that confirms that the NLP are content with the City Council's approach, are there are not considered to be any outstanding issues to resolve at the Examination.

6 What comments have been made and how have they been used?

6.1 Separate reports have been prepared for each of the earlier consultation phases and these include a summary of the key issues, consultation responses and how the Council has responded at each stage. A summary of the number of consultees who have responded and the number of comments made at these earlier phases is included within Figure 1.

6.2 For the Publication stage a summary of the main issues raised and how the City Council has responded is set out below. A more detailed breakdown by Policy and Site is provided at Appendix A. This sets out who has responded on each site, the number of comments made and the City Council's response. Where comments were made relating to minor or typographical issues these are not included.

6.3 A list of all those invited to comment is provided at Appendix C. A list of individuals and organisations that responded is provided at appendix D.

7 Publication Version - Summary of Key Issues and how they have been taken into account

- 7.1 The consultation revealed a number of recurring themes or where issues have generated the greatest number of responses. The key issues are set out below:

Duty to Cooperate Bodies

Overall there has been a generally positive response from Duty to Cooperate Bodies (14 responses in total) but with a number of detailed issues which required further review (particularly from Heritage England and the Local Nature Partnership – a relatively new body). No strategic matters remain unresolved, and where possible changes to the Local Plan have been made to address any concerns raised by the bodies. (See section 5 above).

Retail Policy

Whilst the number of respondents was limited, the depth and number of comments made on retail policy and those sites which include/omit retail use are extensive. Representations also questioned the approach to non-retail uses Primary Shopping Frontages. In response, the Local Plan has been amended to clarify the approach to main town centre uses, the Primary Shopping Frontage has been amended. The proposed approach to non retail uses in Primary Shopping Frontages is considered appropriate.

Housing Mix Policy

The majority of responses focused on whether the policy provides a sustainable approach to housing provision or whether it is too narrow in its focus. Issues of inclusivity and accessibility are also raised. However, the Policy implements policy 8 f the Core Strategy, and is considered appropriate.

Housing Delivery

Responses questioned validity of projections, the appropriateness of site allocations and whether there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that housing requirements will be met. The Local Plan provides for sufficient housing to meet Core Strategy requirements, with a significant buffer to account for slower than anticipated delivery.

Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and Student Housing

Largely positive response to the proposed approach, with the exception of EMPO and Dan Walker who question the threshold constituting 'significant' concentrations of HMOs. The impact and effectiveness of the policy is also questioned. The policy is considered to be an evolution of existing policy approach, and is considered appropriate to tackling the issues the policy seeks to address.

Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles

The policy was subject to objection from KFC who feel Policy LS1 is too biased against hot food takeaways and is not supported by evidence to link obesity and proximity to hot food takeaways. The Policy is however supported by substantive local evidence (set out in the retail background Paper Addendum 2017), and has

also been amended to respond to elements of the objection, in particular, clarifying that the approach only applies in respect to Secondary Schools.

Site Allocations

With the exception of school sites/playing fields sites (see below) there has been a relatively modest response specifically relating to each site allocation including objections, support and general comments.

Former School/Playing Field sites

These site allocations generated by far the most consultation responses with concerns generally relating to loss of green space, transport congestion, privacy, devaluation of properties and impact on local services. However, all the sites have been subject to site assessment, sustainability assessment, and have been subject to open space toolkit assessment. In some instances (PA24, College Way Melbury Playing Field and PA25, Chingford Road Playing Field) amendments have been introduced to mitigate the impact of development.

Additional Site Allocations

9 responses relate to requests for new (or extended) site allocations (this includes 3 responses in favour of supporting the allocation of New Aspley Gardens allotments).

8 What happens next and where can I find more information?

- 8.1 The Local Plan Part 2 and any proposed changes will be submitted to the Secretary of State along with supporting documents and copies of all the comments received. An independent planning inspector will be appointed by Government and a Public Examination held to review if the plan is sound. If, after the examination, the Local Plan is found to be sound, the City Council will adopt the plan and use it in making future decisions on the use of land and in determining planning applications.

More details on the Local Plan and next steps can be found at:
<http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/revisedpublication>

Alternatively, please contact the Policy and Research Team at Nottingham City Council at Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG by email: localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk or by telephone: 0115 876 34594).

Appendix A – Summary of Representations by Policy and Site

Figure 2 Representations at Publication Stage by Policy and on supporting documents.

Site	No. of organisations /individuals who responded	No. of representations
Policy CC1: Sustainable Design and Construction	4	9
Policy CC2: Decentralised Energy and Heat Networks	1	1
Policy CC3: Water	4	10
Policy EE1: Providing a Range of Employment Sites	2	3
Policy EE2: Protecting Existing Business Parks/Industrial Estates	2	2
Policy EE3: Change of Use to Non-Employment Uses	3	3
Policy EE4: Local Employment and Training Opportunities	1	2
Policy SH1: Major Retail and Leisure Developments within the City Centre's Primary Shopping Area	4	8
Policy SH2: Development within Primary Frontages	2	13
Policy SH3: Development within Secondary Frontages	1	7
Policy SH4: Development of Main Town Centre Uses in Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Locations	7	18
Policy SH6: Food and Drink Uses and High Occupancy Licensed Premises/Entertainment Venues within the City Centre	2	4
Policy SH7: Centres of Neighbourhood Importance (CONIs)	3	10
Policy SH8: Markets	2	2
Policy RE1: Facilitating Regeneration	4	9
Policy RE2: Canal Quarter	5	10
Policy RE3: Creative Quarter	3	5
Policy RE4: Castle Quarter	2	3
Policy RE5: Royal Quarter	3	8
Policy RE6: The Boots Site	1	1
Policy RE7: Stanton Tip	3	4
Policy RE8: Waterside	6	6
Policy HO1: Housing Mix	8	19
Policy HO2: Protecting Dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) suitable for Family Occupation	3	4
Policy HO3: Affordable Housing	2	3
Policy HO4: Specialist and Adaptable Housing	2	2
Policy HO5: Locations for Purpose Built Student Accommodation	5	9
Policy HO6: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and Purpose Built Student Accommodation	7	29
Policy DE1: Building Design and Use	5	7
Policy DE2: Context and Place Making	5	7
Policy DE3: Design Principles for Development within the City Centre Primary Shopping Area	3	3
Policy DE4: Creation and Improvement of Public Open Spaces in the City Centre	2	5
Policy DE6: Advertisements2	2	2

Site	No. of organisations/individuals who responded	No. of representations
Policy HE1: Proposals Affecting Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets	5	13
Policy HE2: Caves	2	3
Policy LS1: Food and Drink Uses and Licensed Entertainment Venues Outside the City Centre	1	8
Policy LS2: Safeguarding Land for Further and Higher Education Facilities	2	14
Policy LS4: Public Houses outside the City Centre and /or designated as an Asset of Community Value	2	4
Policy LS5: Community Facilities	2	4
Policy TR1: Parking and Travel Planning	4	6
Policy TR2: The Transport Network	6	7
Policy TR3: Cycling	7	17
Policy EN1: Development of Open Space	13	20
Policy EN2: Open Space in New Development	2	4
Policy EN3: Playing Fields and Sports Grounds	2	6
Policy EN4: Allotments	3	3
Policy EN5: Development Adjacent to Waterways	5	8
Policy EN6: Biodiversity	6	29
Policy EN7: Trees	3	4
Policy MI1: Minerals Safeguarding Area	4	5
Policy MI2: Restoration, After-use and After-care	5	6
Policy MI3: Hydrocarbons	3	4
Policy IN2: Land Contamination, Instability and Pollution	5	10
Policy IN4: Developer Contributions	3	4
Site Allocations	1	2
Appendix 1 – Parking Guidance	2	2
Appendix 2 – Schedule of Proposed Transport Network Schemes and Status forming part of Policy TR2	1	3
Appendix 3 – Housing Delivery	3	3
Appendix 4 – Employment Delivery	1	1
Appendix 6 – Methodology for Determining Areas with a ‘Significant Concentration’ of Houses in Multiple Occupation/Student Households	3	9
Whole Document	32	47
section four Development Management Policies – Places For People	1	1
section five Development Management Policies – Our Environment	2	3
section six Development Management Policies – Making it Happen	1	1
Policies Map Changes	6	12
Omission Sites	6	27
Omission Policies	5	5
Miscellaneous Comments	5	6
Irrelevant to Local Plan	4	5
Housing Background Paper	2	3

Site	No. of organisations /individuals who responded	No. of representations
Green Belt Background Paper	2	2
Transport Background Paper	1	1
Site Assessment Background Paper	1	1
Minerals Background Paper	1	2
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	1	1
Sustainability Appraisal	4	14
Equality Impact Assessment	1	5
Duty To Cooperate	1	1

Policy CC1: Sustainable Design and Construction	
Number of Consultees - 4	Number of Responses - 9
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust 2795 – Home Builders Federation 3545 – Local Nature Partnership (Late response) 3726 – Aldi Stores	

Summary of Comments

1. Notts Wildlife Trust supports the policy and minor amends are suggested to the justification text regarding distribution of species, green and brown roofs/walls.
2. The Home Builders Federation considers the evidence base relating to an optional higher water standard to be out-dated.
3. HBF queries whether the policy is at odds with the Building Regulations in relation to energy requirements.
4. The Local Nature Partnership (LNP) welcomes the policy but queries whether the focus of the policy is too narrow and if it should consider soils, freshwater etc.
5. Aldi Stores considers that requiring BREEAM excellent is not achievable.

Summary of Nottingham City Council

1. The justification text has been amended to address comments from the Wildlife Trust.
2. The higher water standard is already included in the Core Strategy (adopted 2014), the evidence base is considered robust and supported by Severn Trent Water and the Environment Agency.
3. The energy policy does not conflict with Building Regulations but encourages higher standards where possible.
4. Following meetings with the LNP to review the full evidence base, the LNP have confirmed they have no objections subject to agreed amendments (not relating to this policy).
5. The policy text has been clarified in relation to requirements for BREEAM Excellent to clarify that this is required where viable and feasible.

Policy CC2: Decentralised Energy and Heat Networks	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. LNP suggests amending wording of criteria 2 replacing 'should' with 'must' so that opportunities to improve energy performance and reduce operational energy costs are not missed.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Wording of Policy CC2 considered being as robust as possible as NPPF and national standards for energy efficiency prevent LAs from adopting local energy standards and require consideration of site-specific requirements, viability and deliverability. LNP has subsequently written to confirm they are content with the Local Plan approach subject to the proposed amendments.

Policy CC3: Water	
Number of Consultees - 4	Number of Responses - 10
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 1685 – Severn Trent Water (STW) - (Late response) 3545 – Local Nature Partnership LNP) - (Late response) 3726 – Aldi Stores</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT support the principle of the policy, the reference to the Water Framework Directive, reference to SuDS and reference to future management and securing of a mechanism for funding within the policy. The Trust suggests reference to should be added to the [Ciria SuDS Manual](#) (chapter 6) due to the potential biodiversity value from using SuDS.
2. STW notes that a joined up approach to water management in development is financially beneficial and the benefits can be shared. STW would like to continue to be involved and offer help, guidance and expertise in water management.
3. LNP welcomes Policy CC3 and its focus on the impact of development on water consumption, quality and flood risk but wishes to ensure that the extent, spatial distribution and quality of freshwater, including groundwater and the combined impact from all proposed development has been considered. The Partnership also suggests strengthening the policy by changing “All developments will be encouraged to include Sustainable Drainage Systems where appropriate” to ‘All development must include Sustainable Drainage Systems where appropriate’.
4. Aldi comment that CC3(5) encourages runoff from brownfield sites to deliver a 30% reduction. Table 5 of the NPPF technical guidance requires a 20 to 30% uplift. A 30% uplift is only applicable where a 70 year design life is required. Policy should specify 20%.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. It is anticipated that SuDS SPD will be produced which will use the most up to date information as confirmed by paragraph 3.26. The Council is aware of the SuDS manual and this should be used as a reference for developers in the design and development of SuDS but specific reference to this guidance is not considered necessary. Additional policy and justification text has been added to acknowledge the potential biodiversity value of using SuDS.
2. STW comments noted.
3. Following subsequent discussions with the LNP on the range of evidence and partners involved in the development of the policy, they have written to confirm they are content with the Local Plan approach subject to the proposed amendments.

4. The Policy has been drafted to comply with the NPPF and considers technical feasibility, viability and deliverability in seeking SuDS schemes on minor development. It should be noted that national policy covers major schemes therefore further amendment is not required. In response to comments by Aldi, it is noted that the NPPF Technical Guidance was withdrawn in March 2014 and replaced by the NPPG and guidance on Flood Risk Assessment: Climate Change Allowances (February 2016). These documents do not preclude the approach proposed in Policy CC3.

Policy EE1: Providing a Range of Employment Sites	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded 3223 – Thames Water Pension (TWP) 3731 – Nottingham Trent University Planning & Design (NTU)	

Summary of Comments

1. TWP objected – stating that sites which are allocated in the Local Plan for alternative forms of development (not necessarily involving employment uses) should not be included within Policy EE1 concerning the allocation of employment uses. Reference to these sites in Policy EE1 is unsound.
2. Nottingham Trent University (Planning & Design) supported the policy in particular part c) which recognises future need to provide sites to meet needs of technology sector, and, also commented that certain employers will value being in close proximity to the university.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Disagree with TWP - It is entirely appropriate to include sites which have the potential to provide employment use including those which are capable of mixed use development with EE1.
2. NTU support noted.

Policy EE2: Protecting Existing Business Parks/Industrial Estates	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
2813 – Wilson Bowden 3726 – Aldi Stores	

Summary of Comments

1. Wilson Bowden comment that they understand the City Councils desire to 'protect' its key business and industrial locations from inappropriate development in order to maintain their integrity and function, but consider that Policy EE2 is inflexible as non 'B' Class uses are a major contributor to employment within the city and conurbation and many could be accommodated, subject to appropriate policy drafting, on most of the stated business parks and industrial estates referenced by policy EE2 without compromising their essential economic function. Wilson Bowden seeks a change to redefine or expand the definition of 'employment uses' as set out in the Draft Part 2 Local Plan glossary to be consistent with the NPPF or set out criteria within policy EE2 to enable flexible consideration of other economic uses.
2. Aldi Stores comment that the Policy restricts development on defined existing employment areas to B class uses. This ignores the NPPF definition of employment generating uses, which includes retail use, recommend amending policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The definition of employment uses is wider than the adopted Local Plan and is wider than previous draft of the plan - the Glossary defines employment uses not just as B uses, but including certain sui generis uses. It is important to protect major business parks and industrial estates from inappropriate development in order to maintain their integrity and function. No policy will be applied in isolation, and retail and leisure uses are covered by other policies in the plan. The plan has been amended to exclude the south eastern parcel of Nottingham Business Park from EE2 to reflect the planning permission for retail and leisure uses.
2. The Local Plan Glossary defines employment uses not just as B uses, but including certain sui generis uses. Retail is explicitly excluded from this definition and is covered by other policies of the plan, which are sufficient to determine any planning applications for retail use on employment sites.

Policy EE3: Change of Use to Non-Employment Uses	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England (HE) 3689 – Calverton Parish Council (CPC) 3766 – Legal & General Property - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. The client of Legal & General Property owns the Robin Hood Industrial Estate site at Alfred Street South comments that support is given to the emerging Policy EE3 where it would not prejudice the ability for under-used employment sites such as this to come forward for alternative uses (including residential).
2. Calverton Parish Council comment that EE3 is at odds with the NPPF. Comment that the market cannot be “forced” to provide grade “A” offices.
3. Historic England comment that Policy EE3 should be caveated to take the Historic Environment into consideration.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The policy will be reworded to be more flexible when considering the regeneration of previously-used employment sites and employment premises.
2. It is widely acknowledged that there is a shortage of grade “A” offices in Nottingham, and it is only right that the Plan seeks to remedy this shortage by allocating suitable sites for office development.
3. It is not considered necessary to include specific provision within EE3 concerning Heritage issues. All policies should be read in conjunction with the Local Plan Part 1, and Heritage issues are addressed elsewhere in the plan.

Policy EE4: Local Employment and Training Opportunities	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded 3731 – NTU (Planning & Design)	

Summary of Comments

1. Nottingham Trent University support the policy in making it easier to obtain a job in the City through increased training opportunities and promoting labour agreements following regeneration programmes.
2. NTU is a key partner in delivery of outcomes through training highly-skilled graduates and seeking their retention. Support policy as a more inclusive and accessible process of finding employment and training in future.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support noted
2. Support noted

Policy SH1: Major Retail and Leisure Developments within the City Centre's Primary Shopping Area	
Number of Consultees - 4	Number of Responses - 8
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>3160 – Intu Properties 3726 – Aldi Stores 3739 – Land Securities PLC (LSPLC) 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. Intu Properties asks for clarification on the area covered by Policy SH1 and if development in location other than Broadmarsh Centre or Victoria Centre can come forward at the same time of development at the two centres.
2. Aldi Stores argues that Policy SH1 directs retail development toward Primary Frontages neglecting other part of the City.
3. LSPLC argue that the Policy should focus more on retail development rather than leisure and office development, since the result of the 2015 Retail Study showed a decline in retail floorspace.
4. LSPLC believes that the Policy is focusing too much on the development of Broadmarsh Centre and Victoria Centre at the expense of other parts of the Primary Shopping Area. Land Securities PLC suggests an alternative wording.
5. LSPLC suggest that Policy SH1 and SH2 are in contradiction.
6. LSPLC comment that Policy suggests that development should not contribute to improvement of the public realm and transport improvements.
7. LSPLC suggest removing reference to public realm improvement for developments in the City Centre.
8. NLAF supports the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to Intu Properties, the Policy has been amended to clarify that development in other locations can happen alongside development at the two centres.
2. In response to Aldi Stores, retail development outside the City Centre is covered by Policy SH4.
3. In response to LSPLC, the Primary Shopping Frontage defines areas that should remain predominately retail. The proposed amended text does not comply with Policy 5 of the Core Strategy.
4. In response to LSPLC, the emphasis on the Broadmarsh Centre and Victoria Centre is considerate appropriate due to their importance.
5. In response to LSPLC, Policy SH1 concerns the Primary Shopping Area, while Policy SH2 refers to the Primary Shopping Frontage.

6. In response to LSPLC, subject to meeting the relevant S106 test, contribution from retail development and leisure activities will be sought.
7. In response to LSPLC, public realm improvements are considered very important to maintaining and enhancing vitality and viability. SH1 text has been changed to clarify that development in other locations can happen alongside development at the two centres.
8. Support for the Policy is noted.

Policy SH2: Development within Primary Frontages	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 13
List of Consultees who responded	
3160 – Intu Properties 3728 – Power Leisure Bookmakers (PLB)	

Summary of Comments

1. Intu Property lists several areas that should be removed from the Primary Shopping Frontage.
2. PLB believes the Plan is not justified by evidence or compliant with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
3. PLB notes that the Local Plan should comply with the Regulators Code.
4. PLB supports Policy SH2 in its approach to non-A1 development proposals.
5. PLB believes that criterion a) of Policy SH2 is not measurable and does not provide enough guidelines to assess appropriateness of the development. PLB propose applying a site by site approach and to distinguish between class use A1 and non-A1 development.
6. PLB believes betting shop and other non-A1 use class development are typical of city centres and do not have a negative impact. They also question the lack of evidence for the link between these type of establishments and areas of health and economic deprivation, as presented in paragraph 3.103 in support of criterion i) of the Policy.
7. PLB believe Policy SH2 does not comply with paragraph 23 of the National Planning Policy Framework on positive development and competitive town centres.
8. PLB believes gambling is regulated through the Licensing Act, and thus economic and social considerations mentioned in paragraph 3.103 of the Justification Text are an unnecessary repetition.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to Intu Properties, areas of Primary Shopping Frontage have been removed.
2. In response to PLB, the Plan and in particular Policy SH2 are believed to be based on strong evidence and established socio-economic links, and to be compliant with National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 23 of the NPPF.
3. PLB comments are noted.
4. PLB support is noted.
5. In response to PLB, the Policy SH2 already provides scope for site by site and centre by centre assessment. A distinction between A1 use class development and non-A1 is not believed necessary.
6. In response to PLB, the Policy does not prohibit appropriate development. Regarding the lack of evidence, the UK Government changed the use class of such sites to ensure

greater planning control in light of the proven correlation between such use class and socio-economic deprivation.

7. In response to PLB, the Policy is believed to be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, balancing the objective for a diverse retail offer and supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities.
8. In response to PLB, paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires consideration of broad economic, social and environmental matters in the preparation of Local Plans.

Policy SH3: Development within Secondary Frontages	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 7
List of Consultees who responded	
3728 – Power Leisure Bookmakers (PLB)	

Summary of Comments

1. PLB supports Policy SH2 in its approach to non-A1 development proposals.
2. PLB believes that criterion b) of Policy SH3 is not measurable and does not provide enough guideline to assess appropriateness of the development. PLB proposes applying a site by site approach and to distinguish between class use A1 and non-A1 development.
3. PLB also questions the lack of evidence for the link between these type of establishment and areas of health and economic deprivation, as presented in paragraph 3.110 in support of criterion f) of the Policy.
4. PLB believes Policy SH3 does not comply with paragraph 23 of the National Planning Policy Framework on positive development and competitive town centres.
5. PLB believes gambling is regulated through the Licensing Act, and thus economic and social considerations mentioned in paragraph 3.110 of the Justification Text is unnecessary repetition.
6. PLB notes that the Local Plan should comply with the Regulators Code.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. PLB comment and support are noted.
2. In response to PLB, the Policy SH2 already provides scope for site by site and centre by centre assessment. A distinction between A1 use class development and non-A1 is not believed necessary.
3. In response to PLB, the UK Government changed the use class of such sites to ensure greater planning control precisely in light of the proven correlation between such use class and socio-economic deprivation.
4. In response to PLB, the Policy is believed to be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, balancing objective for a diverse retail offer and supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities.
5. In response to PLB, paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires to consider broad economic, social and environmental matters in the preparation of Local Plans.
6. PLB comments noted.

Policy SH4: Development of Main Town Centre Uses in Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Locations	
Number of Consultees - 7	Number of Responses - 18

List of Consultees who responded

3160 – Intu Properties
3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC)
3223 – Thames Water Pension (TWP)
3726 – Aldi Stores
3731 – Nottingham Trent University (NTU)
3739 – Land Securities PLC
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)

Summary of Comments

1. Intu Properties supports the Policy.
2. Notts CC suggests amending wording of the Policy to refer to landscape and visual impact.
3. TWP supports the simplification of the text relating to the sequential test and main town centre. TWP believes the policy is complex and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, that reference to small scale in criterion a) of Section 1 of the Policy is unjustified, and that criteria f), g), h) and i) of Section 1) of the Policy are addressed in other Policies and do not refer to the sequential test.
4. TWP believes that the requirements set in criteria d) and e) of Section 1 are not clear enough and contrary to the NPPF.
5. TWP believes that site allocations that include main town centre uses should not be subjected to sequential test or impact assessment.
6. Aldi Stores believes that defining a local threshold for impact assessments fails to recognise the differences between different retailers' models.
7. Aldi Stores believes that the Policy is contrary to the definition of edge of the centre present in the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. NTU agrees that the Policy appropriately acknowledges the role of edge of centre uses and notes that, even though proposals must not be detrimental to the economy of the City Centre, the University is an important actor in the residential and commercial development of the City and it sits at the edge of the Primary Shopping Area.
9. Land Securities PLC believe that paragraph 3.118 of the Justification Text leaves the sequential text open to negotiation.
10. Land Securities PLC believe there is no evidence to support the idea that there is scope for substantial investment in leisure facilities.
11. NLAF suggests adding reference to new pedestrian/cycle route as part of the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the Policy is noted.
2. In response to Notts CC, it is considered that Policy DE1 adequately covers landscape and visual impact.
3. In response to TWP, a new footnote has been added to Policy SH4, paragraph of 616a and 616b have been added to the Site Allocation Text, and additional text has been added on Appendix 5 to separate requirements of the sequential test from other policy considerations.

4. In response to TWP, the criteria are believed to be in line with the requirements of the NPPF. In order to increase clarity a new footnote has been added to Policy SH4, paragraph of 616a and 616b have been added to the Site Allocation Text, and additional text has been added to Appendix 5 to separate requirements of the sequential test from other policy considerations.
5. In response to TWP, a new footnote has been added to Policy SH4, paragraph of 616a and 616b have been added to the Site Allocation Text, and additional text has been added on Appendix 5 to clarify when a sequential test is required.
6. In response to Aldi Stores, paragraph 3.116 of the Justification Text has been amended to encourage discussion with the City Council to agree technical details of the Impact Assessment.
7. In response to Aldi Stores, the National Planning Policy Framework requires that local circumstances are considered when defining what constitutes edge of the centre.
8. NTU support and comments are noted.
9. In response to Land Securities PLC, paragraph 3.118 of the Justification Text has been amended to reflect the comment.
10. In response to Land Securities PLC, the scope for substantial investment is not intended only in the leisure sector but to all main town centre uses.
11. In response to NLAF, it is believed that this issue is adequately covered in the Aligned Core Strategy Policy 14.2.

Policy SH5: Independent Retail Clusters	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

Policy SH6: Food and Drink Uses and High Occupancy Licensed Premises/Entertainment Venues within the City Centre	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded 2353 – John Moon 3739 – Land Securities PLC	

Summary of Comments

1. A resident notes that too many venues in the City Centre are targeted to students and not enough to older residents.
2. Land Securities PLC is concerned the Policy will result in an imbalance between the retail offer and leisure offer, in favour of the latter. Amendments to the text are proposed to consider a proportion for leisure use of frontages.
3. Land Securities PLC believes that A5 use and large occupancy uses can impact on the vitality of the Cornerhouse and Royal Quarter.
4. Land Securities PLC support the control over A3 and A4 uses, but believes Policy SH6 is in conflict with Policies SH1, RE5 and PA61.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Comments to the Policy are noted.
2. In response to Land Securities PLC, the criteria-based approach on Policy SH6 is considered a more effective policy compared to a proportion-based policy.
3. In response to Land Securities PLC, SH6 seeks to address the harmful impacts of A5 and large occupancy uses.
4. Land Securities PLC's support and comments are noted.

Policy SH7: Centres of Neighbourhood Importance (CONIs)	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 10
List of Consultees who responded 3727 – Marston’s Inns and Taverns 3728 – Power Leisure Bookmakers (PLB) 3741 – Tesco Stores	

Summary of Comments

1. Marston’s Inns and Taverns and Tesco Stores support the Policy.
2. PLB believes the Plan is not justified by evidence and compliant with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
3. PLB notes that the Local Plan should comply with the Regulators Code.
4. PLB supports Policy SH7 in its approach to non-A1 development proposals.
5. PLB believes that criterion a) of Policy SH7 is not measurable and does not provide sufficient guidelines to assess appropriateness of the development. PWB proposes applying a site by site approach and to distinguish between class use A1 and non-A1 development.
6. PLB believe that betting shop and other non-A1 use class development are typical of city centres and do not have a negative impact. PLB also questions the lack of evidence for the link between these type of establishments and areas of health and economic deprivation, as presented in paragraph 3.135 in support of criterion d) of the Policy.
7. PLB believe Policy SH2 does not comply with paragraph 23 of the National Planning Policy Framework on positive development and competitive town centres.
8. PLB believe gambling is regulated through the Licensing Act, and thus economic and social consideration mentioned in paragraph 3.103 of the Justification Text is an unnecessary repetition.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the Policy is noted.
2. In response to PLB, the Plan and in particular Policy SH7 are believed to be based on strong evidence and establish socio-economic links, and to be compliant with National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 23 of the NPPF.
3. PLB comments are noted.
4. PLB support noted.
5. In response to PLB, Policy SH7 already provides scope for site by site and centre by centre assessment. A distinction between A1 use class development and non-A1 is not believed necessary.
6. In response to PLB, the Policy does not prohibit appropriate development. Regarding the lack of evidence, the UK Government changed use class of such sites to ensure

greater planning control in light of the proven correlation between such use class and socio-economic deprivation.

7. In response to PLB, the Policy is believed to be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, balancing objective for a diverse retail offer and supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities.
8. In response to PLB, paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires the consideration of broad economic, social and environmental matters in the preparation of Local Plans.

Policy SH8: Markets	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded 0311 – Historic England (HE) 3160 - Intu Properties	

Summary of Comments

1. HE suggest including reference to preservation/enhancement of Sneinton Market in the Policy.
2. Intu Properties suggests amending the text to apply the sequential and impact test detailed in Policy SH4 to new extended markets on the edge or outside existing centres.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to HE, Heritage issues are sufficiently addressed in other parts of the Plan and there is no need to add a direct reference in this Policy.
2. In response to Intu Properties, Policy SH8 criteria 1) and 2) have been amended to reflect the comment.

Policy RE1: Facilitating Regeneration	
Number of Consultees - 4	Number of Responses - 9
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0225 – Pedals 0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 3689 – Calverton Parish Council (CPC) 3731 – Nottingham Trent University Planning and Design group (NTU)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals comment that full opportunity must be taken to include good cycling provision as part of wider development and regeneration schemes.
2. CPC Support the Policy, especially reference to use of CPO powers.
3. NWT consider that regeneration needs to be sustainable and that this should be made clear in the policy/supporting text referring to the Local Plan's environmental policies. Trust comment that brownfield land can have the same or greater biodiversity value than greenfield sites Any loss of brownfield land with biodiversity value through development should be fully mitigated (or compensated in line with NPPF). Brownfield land also has the potential to create/enhance Green Infrastructure networks.
4. NTU comment that the Policy is complementary to PA61 to take forward regeneration, and that regeneration is important. NTU further comment that the regeneration message could be improved by way of linking the policy more closely with the Council/Nottingham Trent University's City Campus Development Accord.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Pedals comments noted.
2. CPC comments noted.
3. In response to NWT this policy is about regeneration and although it is acknowledged that biodiversity issues need to be considered, Policies 16 of the ACS and Policy EN6 of the LAPP do not distinguish between brown or greenfield sites will ensure that the issues raised are adequately considered. In addition, the Development Principles include further site specific guidance where relevant. However, additional text added to the justification text for further clarify.
4. NTU comments noted but this policy is not specific to Nottingham Trent University. However, mention of the Development Accord has been included in the justification text for policy RE5.

Policy RE2: Canal Quarter	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 10
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>3223 – Thames Water Pension 3689 - Calverton Parish Council 3722 – ABB Ltd 3739 – Land Securities PLC 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. TWP comment that the Policy requirement for office/employment use is unviable, unnecessarily restrictive and unjustified, and consider that Criterion a) requiring high quality office/employment should be deleted.
2. TWP comment that the Policy does not comply with NPPF and that allocations should develop a flexible use of land. RE2 should therefore be less prescriptive.
3. CPC noted that housing is mentioned for all the City Centre related regeneration areas but there is no estimate of what the residential capacity of those areas might be.
4. ABB Ltd comment that Wilford Road/Queens Road was previously included in the Southside Regeneration Zone and covered by Policy MU2 of the Local Plan 2005, superseded by Policy 7 of the Core Strategy. However the emerging Local Plan does not include the site within the new Canal Quarter boundary. The Local Plan is not justified as it is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. The previous boundary should be retained to include the Wilford Road/Queens Road Site.
5. Land Securities comment that retail development should be encouraged over and above leisure development. Therefore there is no requirement for a significant increase in leisure use as set out in RE2 (g).
6. Nottingham Local Access Forum support Policy RE2 (i) and (j).
7. NLA Forum comment that reinforcement of a tourism route is supported. Plan should recognise heritage value of historic public rights of way, alleyways and walkways, and take opportunities to improve these as set out in the City Centre Design Guide.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Disagree with TWP. NPPF requires LPAs to plan positively for new development including office development. 'Fixing the Foundations' and the Housing White Paper place particular emphasis on increasing density around transport hubs.
2. It is considered that Policy RE2 provides flexibility for a mix of uses. Development principles allow for a mix of uses as part of an overall scheme.
3. In response to CPC -Appendix 3 shows the capacity of all the allocated sites in the Plan, from which capacity can be determined.
4. In response to ABB Ltd the rationale for the Canal Quarter boundary is set out in the City Centre Time and Place Plan. The regeneration zones have been refocused on supporting the functions of distinct areas of the City Centre. The site is currently in

employment use and therefore policies relating to employment land continue to apply to the site.

5. In response to Land Securities RE2 (g) seeks to build on the existing leisure offer in the quarter, to provide a vibrant mix of leisure and retail in a highly accessible location, in which such uses are entirely appropriate.
6. Note NLA's support of Policy RE2 (i) and (j), and of a tourism route.
7. NLA comment that reinforcement of tourism route is supported. Agree that plan should recognise heritage value of historic street patterns, alleyways and walkways. Text of Policy DE2 g) amended.

Policy RE3: Creative Quarter	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 5
List of Consultees who responded 3731 – Nottingham Trent University (Planning and Design group) 3739 – Land Securities PLC 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. Nottingham Trent University comment that they support the encouragement within policy to provide vital specialist training and education facilities that are complementary to creative industries sector. They comment that the policy could go further, in line with national planning policy, in endorsing the redevelopment and regeneration of previously developed sites to provide for flagship higher education facilities.
2. Land Securities PLC comment that given the need to enhance the retail offer of the City Centre, there is no justification for leisure uses forming part of this policy.
3. Nottingham Local Access Forum support Policy RE3 (g)

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Part d) of the policy already covers higher education facilities.
2. Ancillary leisure uses are an important part of the mix required to make the Creative Quarter fulfil its potential as a dynamic driver for the creative economy.
3. Support noted

Policy RE4: Castle Quarter	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded 3739 – Land Securities PLC 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. Nottingham Local Access Forum support Policy RE4(h) and the aspirations and concerns expressed in 3.169 and 3.170.
2. Land Securities PLC comment that given the need to enhance the retail offer of the City Centre, there is no justification for leisure uses forming part of this policy RE3 (c) and (e).

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The support is noted.
2. As a quarter increasingly focussed on tourism culture and leisure underpinned by its heritage value, it is an appropriate location for leisure development.

Policy RE5: Royal Quarter	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 8
List of Consultees who responded	
3731 – Nottingham Trent University (Planning and Design group) (NTU)	
3739 – Land Securities PLC	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. NTU support the land uses and strategic aims, and, comment that the balance of uses would diversify the area's offer and maintain viable levels of footfall, and the provision of additional employment land would help assist economic development objectives associated with the University/Higher Education establishments and their expansion. NTU consider that the proposed allocation of conferencing facilities would increase scope for University to host functions/events.
2. Nottingham Trent University comment the plan should make direct reference to the Development Accord to increase awareness.
3. Land Securities PLC comment that given the need to enhance the retail offer of the City Centre, there is no justification for leisure uses forming part of this policy RE5 (a) and (c).
4. Nottingham Local Access Forum support Policy RE5(i).

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Nottingham Trent University support and comments noted.
2. In response to Nottingham Trent University reference to the Development Accord has been added.
3. In response to Land Securities PLC the quarter is home to significant existing leisure facilities, such as the Royal Centre and the Cornerhouse, as well as the City Centre campus of Nottingham Trent University. It is an appropriate location for leisure development.
4. Nottingham Local Access Forum support noted.

Policy RE6: The Boots Site	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council	

Summary of Comments

1. Nottinghamshire County Council suggests amended wording to Policy RE6 to add reference to links to existing open space/green infrastructure.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Policy text amended to make reference to qualitative improvements to on-site open space provision and links to existing open space/green infrastructure.

Policy RE7: Stanton Tip	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) 3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT welcomes the proposed retention and enhancement of the Local Wildlife sites within Stanton Tip. NWT considers most of the site to have high wildlife value due to regeneration and wishes to see significant parts retained as wildlife habitat/open space/green infrastructure. The Trust consider the whole site is likely to fit the criteria as 'Habitat of Principle Importance' under the NERC Act and will be classed as 'Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land' any losses will need to mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated.
2. NCC suggests amended wording to Policy RE7 to add reference to links to existing open space/green infrastructure.
3. NLAF support Policy RE7 a) f) g) and i).

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to NWT - allocation of this site, alongside many brownfield sites, is required to help to meet the Council's objectively assessed housing need. This is a Strategic brownfield site identified in the recently adopted Core Strategy as a Location for Growth. Development would deliver significant regeneration benefits. It is acknowledged that there is biodiversity interest on the site including 'habitat of principal importance'. However, the level of development proposed will allow for a significant amount of land to remain available for retention and enhancement of biodiversity interest. The Development Principles set out the significant opportunities to enhance and create habitats both within and beyond the site. However, additional text added to justification text to acknowledge that much of the tip has regenerated.
2. In response to NCC the Development Principles for PA11 refer to enhancement to open space and green infrastructure but it is agreed that the suggested change would be useful within the policy as well.
3. NLAF support noted.

Policy RE8: Waterside	
Number of Consultees - 6	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0225 - Pedals 3653 – Veolia 3724 – The Bridge Steering Group 3737 – Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) 3739 – Land Securities PLC 3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals and The Bridge Steering Group comment that a foot/cycle bridge between Trent Lane and the Hook (Lady Bay), which would extend the cycle network, assist connectivity with other development/regeneration sites would be the best new crossing option.
2. Veolia commented that the City Council's stated long term aim for the regeneration of the Waterfront is acknowledged but concerns are expressed about the potential conflict with existing waste management facilities and potential alternative uses (mainly residential) as set out in Policy RE8: Waterside and allocations PA82: Freeth Street and PA 83: Daleside Road, Trent Lane Basin. Notts CC acknowledges the wider development aspirations for the Waterside area, however NCC is concerned that this is potentially in conflict with Policy WCS10 of the adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (adopted December 2013). WCS10 seeks to safeguard existing waste management facilities from neighbouring uses which may limit or prevent their continued operation or expansion which reflects national policy in the National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014). The Council points out that there are well established waste management facilities in the Waterside Area within PA82 and PA83 which could be displaced by policies and allocations in the LAPP.
3. Land Securities PLC comment that Policy RE8 (c) is not restrictive enough with regard to leisure development, and does not mention sequential testing or impact assessment, and therefore does not accord with the NPPF.
4. Nottingham Local Access Forum comment that Policy RE8 Waterside e) and f) promoting improvements to linkages and exploiting opportunities to create/enhance public spaces and green infrastructure is supported.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Pedals and The Bridge Steering Group comments are noted. Policy RE8 e) makes provision for improving linkages between the City Centre and adjoining neighbourhoods, and identifies the potential for improved/new cycle and pedestrian crossing over the River Trent. At this stage there is no firm proposal/funding in place for

such a crossing and therefore it would be premature to go beyond the existing policy position.

2. In response to Veolia and Nottinghamshire County Council the comprehensive regeneration of the Waterside area is a long held ambition of the City Council. The aspirations for the Waterside are now beginning to be realised. Both PA82: Freeth Street and PA83: Daleside Road, Trent Lane Basin are long standing allocations, first mooted in the Waterside Regeneration Planning Guidance (2001). The proposals for the Waterside area are also embedded in the Aligned Core Strategy Policy 7 (adopted 2014). The site occupied by Veolia in particular is critical in the implementation of the Waterside. Notwithstanding the above, development proposals will need to have regard to the need to relocate existing businesses and sensitive phasing proposals, which will be set out in a new SPD. In recognition of the presence of established businesses in the area, it is suggested that Policy RE8 including justification text is amended to set out that development proposals will be expected to have regard to the need to relocate existing businesses where necessary and to minimise disruption through sensitive development phasing. Similar wording also added to the justification text of Policy PA82 and PA83.
3. In response to Land Securities PLC comments the new leisure facilities to support new communities and take advantage of a riverside location can be entirely appropriate uses in this area. However, agree that leisure development should be subject to sequential test and impact assessment (if of sufficient scale). A reference to this covering all PA sites will be made to the text on page 171 "Site Allocations" to make this clear.
4. Nottingham Local Access Forum comment noted.

Policy HO1: Housing Mix	
Number of Consultees - 8	Number of Responses - 19
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0917 – Cllr A Peach 1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People’s Movement (NDPM) 1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG) 2353 – John Moon 2795 – Home Builders Federation (HBF) 3689 - Calverton Parish Council (CPC) 3719 – Dan Walker 3730 – EMPO</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. Councillor Peach supports the Policy, particularly as it takes into account amenity, layout, potential to incorporate amenity space, outlook, design and access to community facilities.
2. NDPM comment that the wording of paragraph 4.7 implies that affordable, specialist and student housing are mutually exclusive. They are interlinked – there is a need for affordable housing, whether ‘family’, ‘specialist’ or ‘students’.
3. NDPM considers that 100% of homes (regardless of type) should be built to Category 2 National housing standard, and 10% built to Category 3 standard.
4. NDPM note that contamination is only mentioned in relation to family housing – but this is relevant to all types of housing/developments. Affordability and accessibility are also integral/essential for all.
5. NDPM are concerned that dividing housing into categories does not support an inclusive approach to housing provision. Concerned that HO1 puts emphasis on family housing outside of city centre. Older and disabled people may also wish to live outside of city. Para 4.15 implies that housing for older or disabled people is not family housing. They may be in families.
6. NAG fully supports the policy but considers that there does not appear to be any provision within the policy for the retention of bungalows, the group also considers that there is an additional need for Purpose Built Accommodation for other parts of the housing market.
7. Mr Moon considers that there is too much student housing in the City Centre. The City Centre is deserted at night when students are away.
8. HBF consider that HO1 point (4) and the approach to Self Build risks becoming restrictive, and will not lead to additional housing supply. East Devon Inspector’s report referred to. Any policy should be based on demand, and include “subject to viability considerations and specific site circumstances”.
9. Calverton Parish Council comment that HO1 attempts to influence the type of houses constructed and this will not assist in bringing forward brownfield sites. Such a policy should have been included in the Core Strategy and be addressed by the SHMAA.

10. Mr Walker comments that Policy HO1 is too narrow in its focus and will solely allow family accommodation preventing smaller scale housing schemes coming forward for young professionals other than within the City Centre.
11. EMPO consider that Policy HO1 controls housing supply needs for a significant proportion of the City's population and fundamentally fails the social role of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF. The plan is therefore unsound, will not meet the objectively assessed needs, is not positively prepared, is not justified, will not be effective, and is not consistent with national policy.
12. EMPO consider Policy HO6 and its links to HO1 is likely to be unsustainable and perverse in its outcomes. Whilst the NPPF supports 'mixed' and 'balanced' communities, it equally emphasis the need to 'identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand'.
13. EMPO consider in the context of the NPPF requirement to ensure that the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing are met, the Plan (specifically Policies HO1 and HO6) are unjustified and unsupported by any objective evidence or market understanding.
14. EMPO is concerned that Policy HO1 seeks to ensure that new residential development includes multiple bedrooms but ignores that many private rental schemes are viable and marketable only as single bed apartments. This market particular suits young professionals and graduates and the policy will suppress the supply of single bed accommodation in areas of the City that have large employers requiring a flexible and mobile labour market eg major hospitals resulting increasing rents and graduates leaving the City.
15. EMPO considers Policy HO1 and HO6 will risk Nottingham missing out on substantial investment and housing supply, diverting investment to other cities with a more positive approach to housing delivery, impacting on the City's local growth prospects.
16. EMPO considers that Policy HO1 and HO6 and Appendix 6 will result in wholesale 'zoning out' of a demographic group from the majority of the cities where students, graduates and emergent communities wish to live.
17. EMPO consider that Policy HO1, HO6 and Appendix 6 methodology seek to apply a blunt, process driven, nominal approach, in an effort to appear technically robust and empirically objective.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Councillor Peach support for policy and comments noted.
2. In response to NDPM, paragraph 4 sets out an intention to provide a range of housing types to ensure a balanced housing stock. 'Affordable', 'specialist' and 'student' housing are standard terms used to describe the nature of housing subsets.
3. The Local Plan requires that a proportion of new homes should be built to be accessible and adaptable. The Council will do this by adopting the Government's optional higher National Standard (Category 2 – Accessible and Adaptable) for 10% of new homes on sites of 10 or more dwellings where viable and practicable. Category 3 dwellings will be encouraged, but not required. This is to ensure that additional requirements do not make development unviable.
4. Contamination is mentioned in the policy in the context of viability of development, rather than impact/protection against contamination, which is dealt with elsewhere in the document, therefore it is not considered necessary to amend wording.

5. It is necessary to categorise housing to ensure an appropriate mix is achieved. Emphasis on family housing is made relative to opportunities to provide such provision within City centre, and does not imply or preclude older or disabled people from living outside the city. Paragraph 4.15 seeks to maximise opportunities for inclusive housing, rather than suggest older and disabled people may not form part of family units.
6. Support for policy is noted. The City Council recognises the important role that bungalows play in providing opportunities for residents to downsize their accommodation and thereby freeing up larger houses for families to occupy. However it is not considered appropriate to have a blanket approach to restricting their loss particular as other alternative accommodation can also free up family housing. Permitted development rights also allow for additional accommodation to be added to bungalows including use of roof space, extensions and alterations without the need for planning permission. Prior approvals for the conversion of offices to residential and general planning permission for new residential schemes within the City Centre are providing additional accommodation suitable for new graduates and young professionals. There are policies in the plan to make a planning judgement on non-student purpose built accommodation. For example, planning permission has been recently granted for 85 apartments at the former petrol filling station on BBC Island/London Road which are intended to be exclusively rented out for this market.
7. Comments noted. The Plan seeks to find a balanced mix of housing in appropriate locations. Student housing is appropriate in some areas of the City Centre.
8. In response to HBF the policy is flexible and positive, in that it states that 'consideration should be given' to serviced plot provision. Only if evidence of strong demand that cannot be met through other routes will further guidance be prepared to support serviced plot provision. The point about viability and site circumstances is accepted and Policy HO1.4 has been amended to make reference to viability considerations and site circumstances.
9. In response to CPC, Core Strategy Policy 8 sets the strategic framework, section (2) of that policy indicates an emphasis on family housing. HO1 is consistent with this.
10. In response to Mr Walker, Policy HO1 seeks to implement Policy 8 (Housing, Size, Mix and Choice) and Policy 5 (Nottingham City Centre) of the Nottingham Core Strategy. Policy 8 in particular places an emphasis on providing family housing, including larger family housing, to meet the strategic priorities of The Nottingham Plan to 2020 and the aims of the Housing Nottingham Plan 2013-2015. The Housing Nottingham Plan states that there is a continuing need to develop larger family housing in Nottingham as part of the wider mix and balance in order to provide a wider quality of and choice for citizens. Nottingham City Council has a particularly low proportion of homes suitable for families when compared to both the Housing Market Area as a whole and the national average. The policy does not prevent any non-family housing coming forward, but instead sets out that family housing is a key priority for the City and encourages its provision. The policy then sets out a series of criteria that are to be used to determine if a site is suitable for accommodating family housing.
11. In response to EMPO, the council considers that its approach is in line with para 50 of the NPPF requires Local Authorities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Core Strategy Policy 8 sets the strategic framework and section (2) of this policy indicates an emphasis on family housing. HO1 is consistent with this. The

- policy does not prevent any non-family housing coming forward, but instead sets out that family housing is a key priority for the City and encourages its provision.
12. In response to EMPO, Nottingham City Council has a particularly low proportion of homes suitable for families when compared to both the Housing Market Area as a whole and the national average. Policy HO1 and HO6 have been developed to ensure a sustainable mix of homes within communities for new development coming forward including the housing allocations within the LAPP. HO5 is specifically about encouraging PBSA to meet the needs of housing students.
 13. In response to EMPO, Policy HO1 and HO6 are developed to help address the continuing need to develop larger family housing in Nottingham as part of the wider mix and balance in order to provide a wider quality of and choice for citizens in new development coming forward including the housing allocations within the LAPP. With regard to student housing, monitoring of Student Council Tax exemptions has shown a fall of just over 20% in the number of exemptions over the last 4 years (2011-2015) when PBSA schemes are excluded. This shows that in all but one ward the number of exempt properties has fallen over the 4 years. At the same time, the number of Purpose Built Student Accommodation bedspaces continues to increase year on year with over 3,000 additional bedspaces within the same time period.
 14. In response to EMPO, there is a continuing need to develop larger family housing in Nottingham as part of the wider mix and balance in order to provide a wider quality of and choice for citizens. Many sites in the plan including the city centre and regeneration areas are suitable for a range of housing including apartments. The mix of housing on any one site is a matter to be determined at the application stage. Policy HO1 and HO6 have been developed to ensure a sustainable mix of homes within communities for new development coming forward including the housing allocations within the LAPP. HO5 is specifically about encouraging PBSA to meet the needs of housing students. There are locations, particularly within the City Centre and regeneration zones where the Council will support the provision on non-family housing. It is considered that the need can be met for young professions and graduates via the market. For example, planning permission has been recently granted for 85 apartments at the former petrol filling station on BBC Island/London Road which are intended to be exclusively rented out for this market. The policy to provide family housing allows for people who work in the city to also live within the city rather than commute in from further away.
 15. In response to EMPO, It is not agreed that Nottingham will miss out on any investment as a result of the policy. There is no evidence of this. The level of housing completion is roughly in line with the ACS, and includes a range of housing choices.
 16. In response to EMPO, the policies and appendix control the growth in numbers of student and other HMOs whilst at the same time promoting PBSA in the right locations. The policy will help to address areas of the City where existing communities have been 'zoned out' from their area where there is a significant proportion of HMOs households. The policies are designed to rebalance these communities by controlling the provision of further HMOs.
 17. In response to EMPO, the policy is worded so that it is not just the 10% threshold that is considered but also a range of issues including, the individual characteristics of the building or site and immediate locality, impact of existing HMO and PBSA on the area, whether there would be a management plan and appropriate levels of car and cycle parking, etc.

Policy HO2: Protecting Dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) suitable for Family Occupation	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded 0917 – Cllr Peach A 1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG) 3517 – Nottingham Park Estate (NPE)	

Summary of Comments

1. Councillor Peach supports the Policy.
2. NAG supports the Policy.
3. NPE supports the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Councillor Peach support for the Policy is noted.
2. NAG support for the Policy is noted.
3. NPE support for the Policy is noted.

Policy HO3: Affordable Housing	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People’s Movement (NDPM) 2795 - Home Builders Federation (HBF)	

Summary of Comments

1. NDPM suggests increasing the percentage of Affordable Houses required in all schemes.
2. NDPM mentions that there is no reference to the required percentage of new Category 3 dwellings.
3. HBF may wish to revise their comments on Policy HO3 as a result of any changes to the Housing and Planning Bill.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to NDPM it is clarified that the affordable housing target is based on a Needs Assessment and will be considered in the context of the deliverability and viability of development sites and the submission of robust viability assessments.
2. In response to Nottinghamshire Disabled People’s Movement, the guidelines of the “Government’s Optional Higher National Standard” have been implemented. Category 3 are encouraged but not required.
3. Comments on the Policy are noted.

Policy HO4: Specialist and Adaptable Housing	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded 1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People’s Movement (NDPM) 2795 - Home Builders Federation (HBF)	

Summary of Comments

1. NDPM suggests that all houses should be built to Category 2 standards and 10% to Category 3 standards.
2. HBF suggests that the 10% of houses to be built to Category 2 standards should be justified on need and through a viability test.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to NDPM, the guidelines of the ‘Government’s Optional Higher National Standard’ have been implemented. Category 3 are encouraged but not required.
2. In response to HBF the need basis is covered in the Sustainable, Inclusive and Mixed Background Paper and viability is covered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Viability Assessment.

Policy HO5: Locations for Purpose Built Student Accommodation	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 9
List of Consultees who responded	
0917 - Cllr Peach A 1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People’s Movement (NDPM) 1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG) 3520 – Nottingham Trent University (NTU) 3523 – University of Nottingham (UoN)	

Summary of Comments

1. Councillor Peach supports the Policy.
2. UoN supports the Policy.
3. NAG supports the Policy in principle.
4. NDPM suggests requirement for student accommodation to be built to Category 2 standard.
5. NAG questions criteria d) of the Policy.
6. NAG believes that the wording of paragraph 4.47 of the Justification Text of the Policy promotes the number of students living in private rented accommodation close to the University.
7. NTU suggests requiring developers of student accommodation to demonstrate need or have formal agreements with either the University or another provider of Higher Education.
8. NTU suggests a list of elements that should be addressed when assessing need for additional student accommodations.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Councillor Peach support for the Policy is noted.
2. UoN support for the Policy is noted.
3. NAG support in principle the Policy is noted.
4. In response to NDPM, student accommodations do not fall within the use class requiring proportion of Category 1,2 or 3 dwellings.
5. In response to NAG, reuse of sites listed in criterion d) will be supported when it supports regeneration of underuse premises.
6. In response to NAG, the Council will promote Purpose Built Student Accommodation and control of HMOs but must accept the fact that some students will still prefer to live in traditional housing, especially that located close to University campuses.
7. In response to NTU, Policy HO5 has been amended to reflect the comment.
8. In response to NTU, paragraph 4.50 of the Justification Text of the Policy has been amended to include the suggested elements.

Policy HO6: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and Purpose Built Student Accommodation	
Number of Consultees - 7	Number of Responses - 29
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0917 - Cllr Peach A 1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG) 3517 - Nottingham Park Estate (NPE) 3520 – Nottingham Trent University (NTU) 3523 – University of Nottingham (UoN) 3719 – Dan Walker 3730 – East Midlands Property Owners (EMPO)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. Councillor Peach supports the Policy.
2. NAG supports the Policy and the elements of the Justification Text.
3. NAG suggests removing Permitted Development Rights that allows for alteration and extensions that result in additional bedrooms.
4. NPE supports the Policy.
5. NTU suggests creating a Supplementary Planning Document on minimum space standard and general layout of new accommodation.
6. NTU suggests that need for development could be assessed through a formal agreement with University or another provider of Higher Education.
7. EMPO questions lowering the threshold of significant concentration of HMOS from 25% to 10%.
8. EMPO considers that Policy HO6 in combination with Policy HO1 will prove unsustainable and will result in detrimental impact.
9. EMPO considers that Policy HO6 will have negative impact on the community and the wider economy of the City, and protects the interest of an established minority.
10. EMPO believes there will be increasing demand for private accommodation, and that the Policy prevents this growth.
11. EMPO believes that the Plan in general and Policy HO1 and HO6 specifically are not supported by objective evidence.
12. EMPO believes the Policy is in breach of national policy and will exacerbate the housing crisis.
13. EMPO believes the Policy will divert investment to other cities impacting the growth of the City.
14. EMPO believes the Policy will result in students, graduates, emergent communities being excluded from some areas of the City.
15. EMPO believes 10% is not in line with the real market share of HMOs.
16. EMPO believes Policy HO1, HO6 and Appendix 6 Methodology to be a blunt, process driven, nominal approach, used in an effort to appear technically robust and empirically objective.

17. EMPO suggests focusing on quality of HMOs rather than restricting the number.
18. EMPO believes that the demand for private accommodation close to the University will always be present. EMPO believes that the current legislation is resulting in under occupancy of C3 dwellings.
19. EMPO believes that the Policy promotes a negative image of HMOs and the private rental market.
20. EMPO believes that the Building Balanced Communities Supplementary Planning Document has struggled to deal with studentification, and that the problem needs a multi-agency approach.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Cllr Peach support for the Policy is noted.
2. NAG support for the Policy and elements of the justification text are noted.
3. In response to NAG, the implementation of Article 4 Direction requires strong justification and it only likely in limited circumstances.
4. NPE support for the Policy is noted.
5. In response to NTU, the National Planning Policy Framework requires space standards to be set out in a Local Plan. It is also believed that criteria h) of the Policy addresses the issues. An additional criteria i) has been added to the Policy.
6. In response to NTU the issues raised are believed to be sufficiently covered by the Policy HO5.
7. In response to EMPO it is believed that 10% is the adequate balance.
8. In response to EMPO it is believed that the combination of the two policies will ensure a sustainable mix of new developments, also considering the contribution of HO5.
9. In response to EMPO it is believed that the Policy will have a positive impact on communities.
10. In response to EMPO policy HO6 only refers to HMOs and not the whole rental market.
11. In response to EMPO the reduction of students in private rented accommodation is evidenced by the monitoring of Student Council Tax Exemptions in the year 2011-2015.
12. In response to EMPO there is no evidence of a shortage of HMO accommodation or increase in rent price, and it is believed that the combination of Policies HO5, HO6 and HO1 will ensure a sustainable mix of new developments.
13. In response to EMPO there is no evidence that investment will leave the City as a result of the Policy.
14. In response to EMPO it is believed that the Policy will rebalance communities.
15. In response to EMPO, Census data and the HMO database demonstrates that the current share is less than 10% of the total housing stock.
16. In response to EMPO a range of criteria have been included for consideration alongside with setting the 10% threshold.
17. In response to EMPO the licensing system is in place to ensure high quality standard.
18. In response to EMPO the City Council has no control or evidence on the fact that C3 dwellings are under occupied.
19. In response to EMPO the City Council recognises the contribution and importance of HMOs but also the issues associated with high concentrations of single household types.

20. In response to EMPO evidence demonstrates that the number of Student Council Tax exempt properties (excluding Purpose Built Student Accommodations) is decreasing, and the City Council is working with a wide range of agencies to tackle the problem.

Policy DE1: Building Design and Use	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 7
<p>List of Consultees who responded</p> <p>0917 – Cllr Peach A 1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG) 2795 – Home Builders Federation (HBF) 3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC) 3697 – Barbara Davis</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. An individual requested that the plan should take the needs of visually impaired people into account, specifically referring to the need for colour-contrasting street furniture.
2. Councilor Peach supports the policy, commenting that it is essential that developments are of good quality, are fit for purpose, are sustainable, are safe and take into account local amenities and local residents.
3. The HBF states that evidence is required on need, viability, and impact on affordability.
4. NAG supports the policy.
5. Notts CC considers it may be beneficial to give further consideration to minimisation of waste (above/beyond Local Plan Part 1) in detailed development management policies in this Part 2 document.
6. Notts CC considers that more specific reference should be made to Landscape Character Assessment and related criteria.
7. Notts CC considers that the plan does not provide criteria to assess the impact of development proposals on the landscape.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Policy DE1 already requires consideration of needs of people with disabilities.
2. Councilor Peach support for the Policy and comments are noted.
3. In response to HBF, the need basis is covered in the Sustainable, Inclusive and Mixed Background Paper and viability is covered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Viability Assessment.
4. NAG support for the Policy is noted.
5. In response to Notts CC, Policy DE1 has been amended to include requirement to consider principles of sustainability in design of development, including renewable resources, recycling, accessibility and efficiency of use and appropriate techniques to minimise the impact of surface water discharges.

6. In response to Notts CC, It is considered that both policies DE1 and DE2 along with the justification text at para 4.75, and references to the Landscape Character Assessment in the relevant Development Principles is sufficient.
7. In response to Notts CC, it is considered that both policies DE1 and DE2 along with the justification text at para 4.75 and with reference to the Landscape Character Assessment in the relevant Development Principles is sufficient.

Policy DE2: Context and Place Making	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 7
List of Consultees who responded	
0917 – Cllr Peach A	
1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People’s Movement (NDPM)	
1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)	
3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC)	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. Cllr Peach supports the Policy.
2. NAG supports the Policy.
3. NLAF supports the Policy.
4. NDPM supports the Policy and suggests that guidance linked to the Policy should highlight accessibility and safety issues for disabled, older and other vulnerable users.
5. Notts CC suggest additions to the text of the Policy, in relation to provision of new green space; enhancement of existing Policy DE1, provision of links to adjacent green space; consideration of the relevant policy zone within the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment (2009); and provision of a landscape and visual impact assessment which will inform mitigation required to reduce those impacts.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Cllr Peach support for the Policy is noted.
2. NDPM support for the Policy is noted.
3. NLAF support for the Policy is noted.
4. NDPM support and comments are noted.
5. In response to Notts CC, the City Council believes justification text of Policy EN2 and Policy DE1 are a more appropriate place to reflect these comments. Additional text capturing the issues raised has been added in paragraph 5.19 of justification text of Policy EN2, and in paragraph 4.75 of the justification text of Policy DE1.

Policy DE3: Design Principles for Development within the City Centre Primary Shopping Area	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People’s Movement (NDPM) 3739 – Land Securities PLC 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. Land Securities PLC believes the policy is too restrictive; its elements are covered in other policies, and it should be deleted.
2. Land Securities PLC believes a separate City Centre Design SPD should be considered.
3. NDPM state that whilst part d) of the policy is a positive starting point for design and development, guidelines linked with the policy need to emphasise that there are access issues linked with large scale pedestrianisation.
4. NLAF welcomes DE3 d) of the policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to Land Securities PLC, the Council disagree with the conclusions stated. However, it is considered that the policy relates to the built environment more generally and therefore the policy has been merged with Policy DE2.
2. In response to Land Securities, the Council considers that an SPD is not required as the design policies of the Core Strategy, the emerging Local Plan, supported by the Nottingham City Centre Urban Design Guide (2009) are sufficient.
3. NDPM comment on the Policy is noted. Policy DE2 of the Plan, which relates to context and place making and has been amended to state that developments will be expected to...‘contribute towards the creation of an attractive, safe and inclusive pedestrian environment and wider public realm, that provides good accessibility, especially for people with disabilities....’.
4. NLAF comments noted.

Policy DE4: Creation and Improvement of Public Open Spaces in the City Centre	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 5
List of Consultees who responded 3739 – Land Securities PLC 3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. Land Securities PLC considers that the new square at South Sherwood Street/Burton Street will have detrimental effects on traffic flow, new bus stop and Cornerhouse service yard, and propose deleting it.
2. Land Securities PLC objects that it is not clear how location of public spaces in paragraph 4.100 have been selected, as no evidence is provided.
3. Land Securities PLC objects that the Policy will not support promotion of competitive town centres and that there is no evidence that public spaces will improve the overall quality of the area.
4. Land Securities PLC suggests that if additional public spaces are to be proposed, they should be accompanied by a Supplementary Planning Guidance detailing them.
5. NLAF supports the policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to Land Securities PLC, it is noted that the proposed public spaces (including their form and layout) as shown on the Policies Map in this location are indicative.
2. In response to Land Securities PLC, it is noted that proposals will be subject to consultation and the operational needs of existing business will be taken into account.
3. In response to Land Securities PLC, the proposed public space as shown on the Policies Map in this location is indicative, with no detail as to the form/layout. Proposals will be subject to consultation and the operational needs of existing business will be taken into account.
4. In response to Land Securities PLC, the proposed public space as shown on the Policies Map in this location is indicative, with no detail as to the form/layout. Proposals will be subject to consultation and the operational needs of existing business will be taken into account.
5. Support for the policy is noted.

Policy DE5: Shopfronts	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

Policy DE6: Advertisements	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People’s Movement (NDPM) 3001 – British Sign & Graphics Association (BSGA)	

Summary of Comments

1. NDPM suggests rewording to avoid the Policy contradicting itself.
2. BSGA suggests subdividing part 2 of the Policy to clarify that immediate action may be taken against unlawful advertisement.
3. BSGA argues that the justification text is wrong from a legal point of view.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to NDPM Policy DE6 has been reworded for clarity.
2. In response to BSGA part 2 of Policy DE6 has been reworded for clarity.
3. In response to British Sign & Graphics Association, the justification text is not believed to be wrong from a legal point of view.

Policy HE1: Proposals Affecting Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 13
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0188 – Potter J 0311 – Historic England (HE) 3517 – Nottingham Park Estate (NPE) 3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response) 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. The Policy is considered unsound as it does not protect the environment sufficiently.
2. HE suggests making stronger mention of the Nottingham Heritage Strategy.
3. HE suggests mentioning the presumption against demolition of buildings.
4. HE mentions that the most recent revision of the National Planning Policy Framework directs Local Authorities to identify specific opportunities for conservation of heritage assets.
5. NPE supports the Policy in principle.
6. NPE expresses disappointment that the Park Estate was not referenced in the Nottingham Heritage Strategy.
7. NPE notes that there is no reference to the Park Conservation Plan.
8. NPE recommends reviewing and updating the Park Conservation Plan.
9. NPE wishes for planning applications to include more detailed character and building analysis.
10. LNP supports the Policy.
11. NLAF supports the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Policy is considered appropriate to protect the environment and is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. In response to HE paragraph 4.121 of the Justification Text of the Policy covers the Heritage Strategy sufficiently.
3. In response to HE it is believed that presumption against demolition of buildings is sufficiently established as part of the Policy.
4. In response to HE the Policy takes account of the revision to the National Planning Policy Framework and of the Nottingham Heritage Strategy (2015-2030).
5. Support for the Policy is noted.
6. In response to NPE the absence of reference to the Park Estate within the Nottingham Heritage Strategy is not considered to be a Local Plan issue.
7. In response to NPE paragraph 4.120 of the Justification Text of the Policy has been amended to include reference to Conservation Plans.

8. In response to NPE a review of the Park Conservation Plan is not considered necessary at this time.
9. In response to NPE, the desire for more detailed character and building analysis in planning applications is not considered to be a Local Plan issue.
10. LNP support for the policy is noted.
11. NLAF support for the policy is noted.

Policy HE2: Caves	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded 0311 – Historic England (HE) 3661 - NCC Historic Environment Record	

Summary of Comments

1. HE proposes replacing Urban Archaeological Database 'UAD' with Historic England Records 'HER' in policy and justification.
2. NCC Historic Environment Record supports the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council

1. In response to HE the amendment has been made.
2. Support for the Policy is noted.

Policy LS1: Food and Drink Uses and Licensed Entertainment Venues Outside the City Centre	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 8
List of Consultees who responded	
3744 – Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC)	

Summary of Comments

1. KFC believes the way Policy LS1 regulates development of hot food takeaways is not based on the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. KFC argues that there is no evidence to link obesity and proximity to Hot Food Takeaways.
3. KFC believes the Policy will result in “banning” hot food takeaways from the City Centre, and makes negative assumptions on the quality and effects of food served in such establishment.
4. KFC argues that criterion e) is not clear enough in how to assess cumulative impact.
5. KFC suggests focusing more on provision and improvement of open space, sport and recreation facilities to address obesity.
6. KFC suggests removing criteria e), f) and g) to make the Policy more general and less biased against hot food takeaways.

Summary of Nottinghamshire City Council Response

1. In response to KFC, Policy LS1 is based on the National Planning Policy Framework as it addresses health status through improving quality of food, especially for school age children. To make it more proportionate, however, Policy LS1 criterion g) and paragraphs 4.158 and 4.159 has been amended, applying only to secondary schools.
2. In response to KFC, Public Health England and Local Government Association argue that obesity is a complex problem that should be addressed through a holistic approach, including land use planning. Evidence is provided in the Retail Background Paper Addendum 2017.
3. In response to KFC, locations within centres are excluded from the Policy (distribution of hot food takeaways is available in the Retail Background Paper Addendum). Public Health England support the evidence base of the Policy, and applicants can demonstrate their establishment will not have negative impact on health as per criterion g).
4. In response to KFC, cumulative impact is influenced by several factors, and it is appropriate that the impact of the proposal is considered in its own merits.
5. In response to KFC, the suggestion to promote open space and exercise is welcomed and addressed in other policy, in synergy with LS1.
6. In response to KFC, the Policy’s cumulative impact and the prejudicial effect on future residential development are relevant planning considerations, whilst controlling hot

food takeaways near secondary schools is in line with the NPPF and supported by local evidence and considered appropriate.

Policy LS2: Safeguarding Land for Further and Higher Education Facilities	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 14
List of Consultees who responded 3523 – University of Nottingham (UoN) 3731 – Nottingham Trent University (NTU)	

Summary of Comments

1. UoN supports the Policy.
2. NTU welcomes the reference to support higher education growth and facilities. Nottingham Trent Universities suggests a standalone policy to strengthen the importance of University to bring development forward.
3. NTU suggests referencing directly the Confetti Campus in the criterion b) and its role to support the development of the Creative Quarter. The potential positive impact of a new feature building on Convent Street/Lower Parliament Street should be mentioned as well.
4. NTU suggests using this policy not simply to safeguard land but to promote growth of higher education facilities and to improve the profile and status of existing facilities.
5. NTU suggests using the policy to recognise the role of Universities in tackling skill shortage and its impact on the local economy.
6. NTU notes that the University is a key partner in delivering the requirement of the Policy, in maintaining student in the City (with a consequent positive impact on the local economy), and that it has a Business Plan setting the ambitions to meet the anticipated increase in the number of students.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the Policy is noted.
2. In response to NTU, it is believed that this concept is clear from the sections of the Policy and that a separate policy is not necessary.
3. In response to NTU, the role of such sites is recognised but the Policy is aimed at the development of main Campuses.
4. In response to NTU, the title of Policy LS2 has been changed to “Supporting the Growth of Further and Higher Education Facilities”.
5. In response to NTU the role and importance of Universities is recognised and presented in Policy EE4 and its Justification Text.
6. Comments to the Policy are noted.

Policy LS3: Safeguarding Land for Health Facilities	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

Policy LS4: Public Houses outside the City Centre and /or designated as an Asset of Community Value	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded 1754 – Cllr Ball A 3738 – Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA)	

Summary of Comments

1. Councillor Ball suggests clarifying what evidence is necessary to demonstrate that a public house is no longer viable.
2. CAMRA suggests a series of conditions to be met in order to resist loss of public houses, and proposes a text regarding the viability test and the model to be applied, to be incorporated in the Policy and in the Justification Text.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to Councillor Ball, the text of Policy LS4 and its Justification Text has been amended to clarify the requirements to demonstrate that a public house is no longer viable. In particular criteria a), b), c) and Section 2 have been added, and paragraphs 4.170 and 4.172 have been amended.
2. In response to CAMRA, the Policy has been amended to resist the loss of public houses more effectively. It is considered appropriate for the Policy to apply outside the City Centre and Assets of Community Value. In particular criteria a), b), c) and Section 3 have been added, and paragraphs 4.170 and 4.172 have been amended, incorporating part of the text proposed.

Policy LS5: Community Facilities	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded 1359 – Theatre Trust 3738 – Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA)	

Summary of Comments

1. Theatre Trust supports the Policy.
2. CAMRA suggests a series of conditions to be met in order to resist loss of public houses, and proposes a text regarding the viability test and the model to be applied, to be incorporated in the Policy and in the Justification Text.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the Policy is noted.
2. In response to CAMRA, Criterion 2 e) of the Policy has been amended, and part of the proposed text has been incorporated into criteria a), b), c) and Section 3 of Policy LS4.

Policy TR1: Parking and Travel Planning	
Number of Consultees - 4	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement (NDPM) 3530 – Highways England (HE) 3701 – Cllr Andrew Rule 3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. NDPM believes that the Policy does not address the parking needs of disabled people, the both the needs of disabled people who are blue badge holders or that are not but cannot use public transport.
2. HE supports the Policy.
3. HE suggests using wording 'Transport Assessments' within the body of the policy wording.
4. Councillor Andrew Rule encourages that where residential developments are proposed, on the back of existing developments, that early consideration of their impact on parking is considered from the outset.
5. NLAF supports the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to NDPM the elements referred to in the comment are adequately addressed in Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.
2. Support for the Policy is noted.
3. In response to HE, the term 'Transport Assessments' has been added within the body of the policy.
4. In response to Councillor Andrew Rule, Policy DE2, relating to Context and Place making requires that development do not generate levels of traffic, on street parking, vehicle movements or access arrangements which would have a detrimental impact on traffic congestion, amenity of local occupiers, the efficient operation of the highway network or road safety.
5. Support for the Policy is noted.

Policy TR2: The Transport Network	
Number of Consultees - 6	Number of Responses - 7
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals 3701 – Cllr Andrew Rule 3724 – The Bridge Steering Group 3731 – Nottingham Trent University (NTU) 3739 – Land Securities PLC 3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals and the Bridge Steering Group suggest considering a foot and cycle bridge between Trent Lane and Hook (Lady Bay), mentioning the advantages it will bring and the preparation and consultation work performed so far to make it possible.
2. Councillor Andrew Rule encourages that where residential developments are proposed, on the back of existing developments, that early consideration of their impact on parking is considered from the outset.
3. NTU supports the Policy.
4. Land Securities PLC believes that the City Centre Proposed Pedestrian Improvements/Enhanced Pedestrian Connections in South Sherwood Street and Burton Street and the removal of taxi ranks will negatively affect access to the Cornerhouse.
5. NLAF supports the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to Pedals and the Bridge Steering Group, Policy RE8 makes provision for improving linkages to adjoining neighbourhoods, but considering there is no firm proposal or funding in place it is believed to be premature to go beyond the proposed policy approach.
2. In response to Councillor Andrew Rule, Policy DE2, relating to Context and Place making requires that development do not generate levels of traffic, on street parking, vehicle movements or access arrangements which would have a detrimental impact on traffic congestion, amenity of local occupiers, the efficient operation of the highway network or road safety.
3. Support for the Policy is noted.
4. In response to Land Securities PLC, proposed public space as shown on the Policies Map in this location is indicative, and proposals will be subject to consultation.
5. Support for the Policy is noted.

Policy TR3: Cycling	
Number of Consultees - 7	Number of Responses - 17
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0225 – Pedals 0838 – Sport England (SE) 0977 – Resident's Association Vale 3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC) 3530 – Highways England (HE) 3739 – Land Securities PLC 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals suggest including a series of existing and proposed cycle routes and linkages in the Policy.
2. SE and HE support the Policy.
3. Resident's Association Vale suggests including reference to cycle paths on A52 Derby Road.
4. Notts CC suggests amending paragraph 4.215 of the Justification Text to mention partnership between the Council and other stakeholders.
5. Land Securities PLC believes that cycle route around the Cornerhouse may affect services and should be prepared through a Supplementary Planning Document.
6. NLAF suggests mentioning the need for cycling/walking routes to be clearly separated from vehicular routes, free from street clutter and that are well signed.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to Pedals the Policies Map already includes proposed cycle routes identified with funding through the Nottingham City Cycle Ambition Program. Any additional suggestions have been passed to the Transport Strategy Team.
2. Support for the Policy is noted.
3. In response to Resident's Association Vale, the Policies Map already includes proposed cycle routes identified with funding through the Nottingham City Cycle Ambition Program. Any additional suggestions have been passed to the Transport Strategy Team.
4. In response to Notts CC, paragraph 4.215 of the Justification Text has been amended to reflect the comment.
5. In response to Land Securities PLC, proposed public space as shown on the Policies Map in this location is indicative, and proposals will be subject to consultation.
6. In response to NLAF cycling/walking routes will be designed and considered on a case by case basis.

Policy EN1: Development of Open Space	
Number of Consultees - 13	Number of Responses - 20
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0188 – Mr J Potter 0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 0802 – Natural England (NE) 0838 – Sport England (SE) 1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG) 2409 – Friends of Victoria Embankment (FoVE) - (Late response) 3490 – Tom Huggon Open Spaces Champion Group (OSCG) 3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response) 3705 – Jockey Club 3727 – Marston's Inns and Taverns 3741 – Tesco Stores 3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF) 3783 - Biodiversity Greenspace -NCC (BGNCC)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. The Policy is considered unsound as it does not protect the environment sufficiently.
2. NWT believes criterion c) of the Policy could in some instances result in harm to the environment.
3. NE supports the Policy.
4. SE suggests clarifying that the space toolkit is not to be used regarding formal playing field requirements.
5. NAG supports the Policies Map which shows former Greenholme school playing field as part of the Open Space Network.
6. FoVE supports the inclusion of Victoria Embankment, its surrounds and Meadows Recreation Ground as part of the City's Open Space Network.
7. OSCG suggests assessing green space sites according to proposed criterion.
8. OSCG suggests assessing need from future residents before allocating a site.
9. OSCG believes that there are several opportunities to create new open spaces, such as the creation of a new park at Castle College.
10. OSCG believes that in the previous stages of the preparation of the Plan not enough attention has been given to a call for site for purely open space purposes.
11. LNP suggests strengthening criterion b) of the Policy to promote increasing open space.
12. Jockey Club suggests amending the Policies Map to include green parts of Racecourse site in the Open Space Network and exclude the hard standing and built form of the to the north of the site.
13. Jockey Club believes that Policy EN1 does not provide clear guidance on the appropriate development of Racecourse.
14. Marston's Inns and Taverns and Tesco Stores request the removal of part of the CONI and part of proposed development site from the Open Space Designation.
15. BGNCC suggests emphasising retention and replacement of on-site open space

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Policy is considered appropriate to protect the environment and in line with the NPPF.
2. In response to NWT the wording of the policy has been rearranged to clarify that development should not have a detrimental effect on the environment and biodiversity.
3. Support for the Policy is noted.
4. In response to SE paragraph 5.12 of the Justification Text of the policy has been changed to reflect the representation.
5. Support for the Policy is noted.
6. **Support for the Policy is noted.**
7. In response to OSCG it is noted that Criterion a) of Policy EN1 confirms that development affecting Open Space will be refused unless an assessment has been undertaken, and that the Toolkit Assessment will be used in that instance together with site appraisal and Sustainability Appraisal.
8. In response to OSCG a Toolkit Assessment will be used to assess the existing provision of open spaces.
9. In response to OSCG it is noted that in an urban environment the opportunity to create new open space is limited and is only likely to be achieved through development. Opportunities are included in the Development Principles.
10. In response to OSCG, it is noted that comments were invited on the Open Space Network. It is also noted that in an urban environment opportunity to create new open spaces is limited and it is only likely to be achieved through development. This provision is ensured by Development Principles.
11. **In response to LNP criterion b) of the Policy has been amended.**
12. In response to the Jockey Club, the Open Space Network on the Policies Map has been amended.
13. In response to the Jockey Club, it is believed that criterion c) of the Policy and all other policies in the Plan provide enough guidance to assessment of any development proposal at the Racecourse and to support and promote existing cultural, tourism and sporting facilities.
14. In response to Marston's Inns and Taverns and Tesco Stores, the Policies Map has been amended.
15. In response to BGNCC the development principles have been amended to reflect the comment.

Policy EN2: Open Space in New Development	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded 0188 – Potter J 0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	

Summary of Comments

1. The Policy is considered unsound as it does not protect the environment sufficiently.
2. NWT suggests including open space for biodiversity together with open space for people and recommends including the presence of wildlife sites within the circumstances mentioned in paragraph 5.19 of the Policy.
3. NWT supports future funding for new spaces as mentioned in paragraph 5.18 of the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Policy is considered appropriate to protect the environment and is in line with the NPPF.
2. In response to NWT paragraph 5.18 and 5.19 of the Justification Text of the Policy have been amended to reflect the comment.
3. Support for the Policy is noted.

Policy EN3: Playing Fields and Sports Grounds	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded 0188 - Potter J 0838 – Sport England (SE)	

Summary of Comments

1. The Policy is considered unsound as it does not protect the environment sufficiently.
2. SE supports the principles of the Policy and the inclusion of the Playing Pitch Strategy 2015.
3. SE suggests the inclusion of the Sport and Physical Activity Strategy 2015-2019 and suggests rewording criteria a) of the Policy to include the assessment of the Playing Pitch Strategy 2015.
4. SE suggests using the Policy to implement the Playing Pitch Strategy 2015.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Policy is considered appropriate to protect the environment and is in line with the NPPF.
2. Support for the Policy is noted.
3. In response to SE, criterion a) provides for an assessment to be made of other potential sites not identified in the Strategy. Additional text has been added to paragraph 5.21 of the Justification Text of the Policy to reflect the comment.
4. In response to SE, additional text has been added to paragraph 5.21 of the Justification Text of the Policy to include the Playing Pitch Strategy 2015.

Policy EN4: Allotments	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded 0188 - Potter J 0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 2659 – Archer R	

Summary of Comments

1. The Policy is considered unsound as it does not protect the environment sufficiently.
2. NWT supports the Policy.
3. A resident supports the designation of New Aspley Gardens as an allotment.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Policy is considered appropriate to protect the environment and is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Support for the Policy is noted.
3. Support for the Policy is noted.

Policy EN5: Development Adjacent to Waterways	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 8
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0188 - Potter J 0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 3723 – Placedynamix 3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF) 3783 - Biodiversity Greenspace NCC (BGNCC)</p>	

Summary of Comment

1. The Policy is considered unsound as it does not protect the environment sufficiently.
2. NWT suggests adding a reference to the Water Framework Directive in the Policy.
3. NWT suggests mentioning the Improving Water Quality Guidance for Local Authorities.
4. NWT supports the Policy.
5. NLAF supports the Policy.
6. Placedynamix suggests referring to underused and vacant land around the River Trent and canal network.
7. BGNCC support the Policy provided that the green corridors will be sufficiently large to accommodate a pathway and retain existing trees and plants.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Policy is considered appropriate to protect the environment and is in line with the NPPF.
2. In response to NWT a reference to Policy CC3, which relates to the Water Framework Directive, is added to paragraph 5.35 of the Justification Policy.
3. In response to NWT a paragraph has been added to the Justification Text of Policy CC3 referring to the Improving Water Quality Guidance for Local Authorities.
4. Support for the Policy is noted.
5. Support for the Policy is noted.
6. In response to Placedynamix, it is believed that the Policy makes sufficient reference to this issue in criterion g).
7. Comment to the Policy noted.

Policy EN6: Biodiversity	
Number of Consultees - 6	Number of Responses - 29
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 0802 – Natural England (NE) 0838 – Sport England (SE) 3490 – Tom Huggon -Open Spaces Champion Group (OSCG) 3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response) 3783 - Biodiversity Greenspace NCC (BGNCC)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT supports the policy.
2. NWT suggests amendments to the text of the Policy.
3. NWT suggests referring to the mitigation hierarchy presented in paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. NWT suggests replacing 'notable species' with 'protected species' and those identified as species of principal importance under Section 41 of the NERC Act.
5. NWT suggests referring to paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework in criterion c) of the Policy.
6. NWT suggests clarifying that development can be refused if adequate mitigation or compensation cannot be secured.
7. NWT notes the possible designation of a Derbyshire / Nottinghamshire Nature Improvement Area.
8. NWT suggests strengthening the reference to the need to comply with relevant legislation.
9. NWT suggests including Local Authorities responsibilities in paragraph 5.40 the Justification Text of the Policy.
10. NWT suggests removing references to biodiversity offsetting.
11. NWT suggests including reference to British Standard BS42020 Biodiversity - Code of Practice for Planning and Development.
12. NWT queries if the checklist mentioned in paragraph 5.45 of the Policy includes a number of features important for mitigation schemes.
13. NWT seeks assurance that Local Wildlife Sites are sufficiently protected.
14. NE supports the Policy.
15. NE suggests referring to important sites of geological interest.
16. NE suggests referring more specifically to the potential significant harm from development on all biodiversity.
17. NE queries Nottingham City Council will continue using the DEFRA Biodiversity Offsetting mechanism.
18. It is noted that no biodiversity offsetting site has been identified.
- 19. LNP welcomes the Policy.**

20. LNP is concerned that critical species spatial distribution and combined impact has not been mapped.
21. LNP suggests strengthening the reference to the fact that development should produce no net loss and produce a net gain in biodiversity.
22. BGNCC suggests retaining the bank along the canal as semi-natural open space allowing wildlife movement.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the Policy is noted.
2. In response to NWT paragraph 5.42 of the Justification Text of the Policy has been amended.
3. In response to NWT paragraph 5.37 of the Justification Text of the Policy has been amended to clarify reference to the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. In response to NWT a glossary entry defining “notable species” has been added. The definition includes the types of designation referred to in the comment.
5. In response to NWT criterion c) has been reworded and criteria 3 has been reworded reflecting the principles of paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. In response to NWT paragraph 5.43 of the Justification Text of the Policy has been amended to reflect the comment made.
7. In response to NWT paragraph 5.39 of the Justification Text of the Policy has been amended to include reference to the River Trent strategic corridor.
8. In response to NWT it is not considered necessary to repeat adherence to existing policies.
9. In response to NWT it is not considered necessary to mention Local Authority responsibilities.
10. In response to NWT, biodiversity offsetting is retained as a last resort. Paragraph 5.43 of the Justification Text of the Policy has been amended to clarify this concept.
11. In response to NWT Legislation Guidance does not require use of the British Standard BS42020 Biodiversity - Code of Practice for Planning and Development.
12. In response to NWT the Biodiversity Checklist includes all the mentioned elements.
13. In response to NWT, the development principles have been amended to refer to wildlife corridors.
14. Support for the Policy is noted.
15. In response to NE, criteria 2b) of the Policy has been amended mentioning Local Geological Sites.
16. In response to NE it is believed that criteria d) covers potential impact sufficiently.
17. In response to NE, biodiversity offsetting is retained as a last resort, and it will be implemented outside the City boundary only in exceptional circumstances. Paragraph 5.43 of the Justification Text of the Policy has been amended to clarify this concept.
18. No development proposals requiring biodiversity offsetting have come forward during the trial period.
19. Support for the Policy is noted.
20. In response to LNP the Core Strategy was subjected to Habitat Regulation Assessment. It is not believed necessary to perform a similar assessment for the Land and Planning Policy Document, as it conforms with the Core Strategy. Implementation of the criteria from Policy EN6 and Sustainability Appraisals will ensure that environmental and biodiversity interests are fully considered.

21. In response to LNP, the National Planning Policy Framework, with which Policy EN 6 conforms, includes the commitment to halt decline in biodiversity and minimise impact. Paragraph 5.37 of the Justification Text of the Policy has been amended to further clarify this principle.
22. In response to BGNCC the development principles have been amended to reflect the principle of retention and enhancement of the wildlife corridor.

Policy EN7: Trees	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG) 3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT recommends making specific reference to wildlife and bird/bat surveys.
2. NWT recommends that reference to the Government Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland should be added on criteria 4.
3. NAG suggests strengthening the protection of Ancient Woodland in criterion 4.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to NWT the Policy refers to trees. Other Surveys are mentioned as part of Policy EN7.
2. In response to NWT additional text has been added to paragraph 5.51 of the Justification Text of the Policy referring to Ancient Woodland.
3. In response to NWT additional text has been added to paragraph 5.51 of the Justification Text of the Policy referring to Ancient Woodland.

Policy MI1: Minerals Safeguarding Area	
Number of Consultees - 4	Number of Responses - 5
List of Consultees who responded	
0188 - Potter J 2792 – Coal Authority 3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC) 3545 - Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. The Policy is considered unsound as it does not protect the environment sufficiently.
2. The Coal Authority supports the Policy.
3. Coal Authority and Notts CC note that in paragraph 5.49 the Justification Text refers to Figure 5 but should be Figure 3.
4. Notts CC suggests repeating Map 7 in the main document.
5. LNP supports the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Policy is believed to protect the environment adequately and it is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Support for the Policy is noted.
3. In response to the Coal Authority and Notts CC, amendments to the text have been made.
4. In response to Notts CC, it is believed that it is not necessary to repeat Map 7, as the mineral safeguarding areas are already shown on the Policies Map and also on Figure 3.
5. Support for the Policy is noted.

Policy MI2: Restoration, After-use and After-care	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded	
0188 - Potter J	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
0802 – Natural England (NE)	
2792 – Coal Authority	
3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC)	

Summary of Comments

1. The Policy is considered unsound as it does not protect the environment sufficiently.
2. NWT believes the Policy does not prioritise enough biodiversity-led restoration, and in doing so it is not consistent with the Nottinghamshire Minerals and Local Plan. Additional text and the removal of criterion 5 are suggested.
3. NE supports the Policy.
4. The Coal Authority supports the Policy.
5. Notts CC suggests amending criterion 5 to refer not only to agricultural after-use.
6. Notts CC suggests additional text to paragraph 5.69 of the Justification Text regarding recommended landscape actions and use of native species.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. It is considered that the Policy protects the environment adequately and is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. In response to NWT, the Council agrees that the wording can be made stronger, and amendments to Policy MI2 have been made.
3. Support for the Policy is noted.
4. NE support for policy noted.
5. In response to Notts CC, criteria 5 has been amended removing the reference to agriculture.
6. In response to Notts CC, the proposed additional text has been added to paragraph 5.69 of the Justification Text of the Policy.

Policy MI3: Hydrocarbons	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
2792 – Coal Authority 3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC) 3545 - Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. The Coal Authority suggests modifying paragraph 5.83 of the Policy to clarify ensure that restoration is secured after any phase in case development ceased.
2. The Coal Authority supports the Policy.
3. Notts CC enquires why criterion 6 of the Policy appears under the heading Restoration.
4. LNP welcomes the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to the Coal Authority, Policy MI3 criterion 5 and paragraph 5.80 of the Justification text have been amended to reflect the comment.
2. Support for the Policy is noted.
3. In response to Notts CC criterion 6 has been moved to appear under the heading Appraisal and renumbered accordingly.
4. Support for the Policy is noted.

Policy IN1: Telecommunications	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

Policy IN2: Land Contamination, Instability and Pollution	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 10
List of Consultees who responded	
0188 – Mr J Potter 1540 – Environment Agency (EA) 2792 – Coal Authority 3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC) 3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. The Policy is considered to be unsound as it does not protect the environment sufficiently.
2. The EA notes that the site located over the former landfill site known as Lenton Lane Tip may have serious contamination problems.
3. The EA notes that the site located over the former landfill site known as Lenton Lane Tip is within source protection zone 3 and is underlain by aquifer, where groundwater is sensitive to pollution.
4. The EA supports redevelopment of brownfield sites.
5. The Coal Authority supports the objectives of this Policy.
6. The Coal Authority suggests rewording the Policy to make more consistent with the Preferred Option and with paragraphs 109, 120, 121, and 161 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. Notts CC support the Policy.
8. LNP supports the Policy.
9. LNP argues that the location of allocated sites in the proximity of Air Quality Management Areas and the impact of development will have a detrimental effect on the overall air quality.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. It is believed that the Policy will protect the environment sufficiently and it is in line with the National Planning Policies Framework.
2. In response to the EA, known contamination issues are included in the addendum to the Site Assessments background paper.
3. In response to the EA, known impacts to groundwater and human health are included in the addendum to the Site Assessments background paper.
4. Support for the Policy is noted.
5. Support for the Policy is noted.
6. In response to the Coal Authority, Policy IN 2 has been amended and criterion g) has been added.
7. Support for the Policy is noted.
8. Support for the Policy is noted.

9. In response to the LNP, all environmental constraints have been considered in the Sustainability Appraisals, including proximity to Air Quality Management Areas.

Policy IN3: Hazardous Installations and Substances	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

Policy IN4: Developer Contributions	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded 0838 – Sport England (SE) 2795– Home Builders Federation (HBF) 3490 – Tom Huggon -Open Spaces Champion Group (OSCG)	

Summary of Comments

1. SE registers support for Policy IN4 and considers that the implementation of the Playing Pitch Strategy should be supported within IN4 (or elsewhere within the plan).
2. HBF considers it not obvious in IN4 if the impact of S106 pooling has been considered, which may impact on effectiveness of policy.
3. Open Spaces Champion Group considers that developer contributions should be obtained for improvements to existing open spaces.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. SE's support for policy IN4 noted. Additional text has been added to paragraph 5.21 of the Justification Text of Policy EN3 referring to the need for assessments submitted as parts of planning applications to take the PPS as a starting point.
2. In response to HBF, S106 pooling is now embedded in the planning system, and in drafting the policy, the impact of pooling has been taken into account.
3. In response to OSCG, Policy IN4 sets out that developer contributions will be sought for open space in accordance with Policy EN2 and EN3.

Site Allocations	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
3490 – Tom Huggon -Open Space Champion Group (OSCG)	

Summary of Comments

1. OSCG supports the Policy.
2. OSCG suggests specifying the amount of design space in each Development Principles.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Responses

1. Support for the Policy is noted.
2. In response to OSCG, Development Principles are an indication of key issues relating to each site, but are not intended to be comprehensive development briefs. Amount of open space will be considered in the planning application stage.

Appendix 1 – Parking Guidance	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded 0225 – Pedals 2795 – Home Builders Federation (HBF)	

Summary of Comments

1. HBF suggests that Appendix 1 seems to set a maximum parking standard for houses.
2. Pedals support the Cycle Parking Standard.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to HBF, the term 'Standard' has been replaced with 'Guidance' to reflect the advisory status.
2. Support for the Policy is noted.

Appendix 2 – Schedule of Proposed Transport Network Schemes and Status forming part of Policy TR2	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0977 – Resident's Association	

Summary of Comments

1. A residents' association suggests the wording regarding future expansion of the Nottingham Express Transit is too vague.
2. A residents' association suggests safeguarding provision for the improvements of the A52 Derby Road.
3. A residents' association suggests making provision for the improvements of the A6002 Woodhouse Way/Coventry Lane (within City) into Broxtowe Borough.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to the residents' association the wording is considered adequate to make provision for possible further extensions.
2. In response to the residents' association Derby Road is under the control of the Highway Agency and it cannot be considered as a Local Plan matter.
3. In response to the residents' association the document can only make provision for development within the boundaries of the City of Nottingham.

Appendix 3 – Housing Delivery	
Number of Consultees - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded 3689 – Calverton Parish Council (CPC) 3699 – Telereal Trillium 3702 – Deancoast Ltd	

Summary of Comments

1. CPC suggests allocating land between Cowan Street and Beck Street for residential development.
2. Telereal Trillium notes that the allocation exercise does not provide enough residential development to meet the housing requirement and believes that the Council will need to rely too heavily on windfall development. Suggest applying greater flexibility and preparing a more realistic housing trajectory.
3. Deancoast Ltd believes there is insufficient evidence provided to demonstrate that the City Council will meet its housing requirement.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Responses

1. In response to CPC, sites allocated in the Local Plan must be at least 0.5 hectare in size.
2. In response to Telereal Trillium, it is believed that the objectively assessed housing need requirement is correct, and that as only sites comprising 0.5 hectares or more are allocated, the number of developments on non-allocated sites will be sufficient to meet the Plan requirements.
3. In response to Deancoast Ltd, the supply of housing has been adequately examined in the Core Strategy and City Council's Housing Land Availability Assessment. The Local Plan anticipates meeting the housing requirement with a significant buffer for non-delivery.

Appendix 4 – Employment Delivery	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded 3223 – Thames Water Pension (TWP)	

Summary of Comments

1. TWP believes the proposed mixed use site PA70 should not be included in Appendix 4 'Employment Delivery'.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to TWP, it is considered appropriate to include a site that can potentially deliver employment use in Appendix 4.

Appendix 5: Retail Delivery	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

Appendix 6 – Methodology for Determining Areas with a ‘Significant Concentration’ of Houses in Multiple Occupation/Student Households

Number of Consultees - 3

Number of Responses - 9

List of Consultees who responded

1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)
3523 – University of Nottingham (UoN)
3730 – East Midlands Property Owners (EMPO)

Summary of Comments

1. NAG supports methodology used to identify concentration of HMOs set out in Appendix 6.
2. NAG refers to difficulty in identifying pockets of HMO’s that are surrounded by C3 dwelling houses, and supports officer investigation of new HMO planning applications.
3. UoN supports Appendix 6.
4. EMPO believes 10% is not in line with the real market share of HMOs and it does not represent a ‘significant concentration’.
5. EMPO believes that, even if the City Council presents sufficient evidence to justify the 10% level, the Appendix should be reworded to be more in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. EMPO believes Policy HO1, HO and Appendix 6 Methodology to apply a blunt, process driven, nominal approach, in an effort to appear technically robust and empirically objective, and that the use of census output areas does not take account of the character of individual areas.
7. EMPO believes the Policy will result in students, graduates, emergent communities being excluded from some areas of the City.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the methodology is noted.
2. In response to NAG, the methodology takes the impact on local amenity into account together with the concentration of HMOs in the area.
3. Support for the Appendix is noted.
4. In response to EMPO it is believed that 10% threshold is the adequate balance.
5. In response to EMPO, the methodology takes into account a range of criteria together with the percentage of HMOs in the area.
6. In response to EMPO, It is considered that grouping output areas, as set out in appendix 6, is an appropriate way to look at the ‘community’.
7. In response to EMPO, it is believed that the Policy will rebalance communities.

Appendix 7: Schedule of Caves forming part of Policy HE2	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

Whole Document	
Number of Consultees - 32	Number of Responses - 47
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0182 – The Coal Authority 0259 – Broxtowe Borough Council (BBC) 0311 – Historic England (HE) 0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 0802 – Natural England (NE) 0977 – Resident's Association Vale 1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement (NDPM) 1359 – Theatre Trust 1540 – Environment Agency (EA) 2306 – Mr M Penn 2353 – John Moon 2795 – Home Builders Federation (HBF) 2989 – Ashfield District Council (ADC) 3160 – Intu Properties 3523 – University of Nottingham (UoN) 3529 – Health & Safety Executive (HSE) 3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response) 3590 – D2N2 LEP 3644 – National Grid 3658 – Gemma Campbell 3662 – Bryan Ayres 3666 – Peter Fearon 3681 – Shaun Worley 3689 – Calverton Parish Council (CPC) 3710 – James Thorpe 3715 – John Holdsworth 3721 – Julia Williams 3723 – Placedynamix 3731 – Nottingham Trent University (NTU) 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum 3748 – Linda Hall 3783 - Biodiversity Greenspace (NCC)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. The Coal Authority has no specific comment on the Local Plan and Planning Policy Document.
2. NE supports the Local Plan and Planning Policy Document and has no additional comment.
3. BBC supports the Local Plan and Planning Policy Document and has no additional comment.
4. Theatre Trust supports the document.
5. HE supports the document.

6. NWT notes that it is not indicated what portion of former school and playing field allocated for development will be retained as Open Space. It is also noted that many sites are currently greenfield and that their allocation will contradict Policies EN1 to EN5. It is suggested to map all allocated sites and their relations with existing open spaces.
7. NDPM believes that part of the plan relating to housing, employment, and the environment are inconsistent with inclusion of disabled or older people.
8. The EA supports the document.
9. The EA suggests that developers should follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, refer to the EA Guiding principles and to the government website for further information on land contamination.
10. A resident notes that the Plan may not be legally compliant and justified, as evidenced by the Radford Bridge Allotments appeal.
11. HBF notes that since only 11 years are left before the expiration of the Plan, the Core Strategy should be reviewed fairly soon.
12. ADC supports the document and notes that land to be allocated in Ashfield will have implication for highway infrastructure.
13. Intu Properties mentions that the Broadmarsh Centre and Victoria Centre should be referred to as Intu Broadmarsh and Intu Victoria Centre.
14. UoN has no adverse comment on the Local Plan and Planning Policy Document.
15. HSE notes that advice regarding mixed-use allocations is outside the scope of the general advice that can be given in this representation.
16. LNP questions if the combined net ecological balance of all development has been considered.
17. LNP is concerned that agriculture land classification and the impact on Landscape Character Area has not been considered in full.
18. LNP is concerned that there is a lack of reference to sustainable development.
19. D2N2 LEP supports the document.
20. National Grid supports the document.
21. Four residents object to the document.
22. CPC believes 0.5 hectares threshold is too low and that of all buildings over 1,500 square meters that have been vacant for 6 months should be included.
23. Placedynamix considers there should be greater emphasis on growth within the plan area and less reliance on meeting housing need in neighbouring authorities.
24. NTU supports the policy and welcomes further collaboration.
25. NLAF supports the document.
26. BGNCC (NCC) suggests an addition to the Development Principles regarding enhancement of natural habitat alongside canals.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Responses

1. The Coal Authority's comment is noted.
2. NE's support is noted.
3. BBC comments are noted
4. Theatre Trust's comments are noted.
5. HE's support is noted.

6. In response to NWT the sites are considered suitable for development and have been subject to a Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, Green Belt appraisal and consultation with SE and other statutory bodies. Provision and enhancement of Open Space will be managed through the development management process. It is also noted that the Policies Map already shows all allocated sites and the Open Space network.
7. In response to NDPM, the Plan is considered consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and it is not considered to be inconsistent in its approach to disabled or elderly people.
8. The EA's support is noted.
9. The EA's comment is noted.
10. The residents' comments are noted.
11. HBF's comment is noted.
12. ADC's support and comments are noted.
13. In response to Intu Property the document has been amended to reflect the comment.
14. UoN's support is noted.
15. HSE's comment is noted.
16. In response to LNP, the Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Allocations and the Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Aligned Core Strategy fully evaluated the ecological impact of the Plan.
17. In response to LNP, the impact of development on the small number of green field sites that are of higher agricultural classification has been fully considered, and the impact of development on areas designated in the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment has been considered.
18. In response to LNP, the objective and policies part of the Aligned Core Strategy are believed to be perfectly in line with the definition of sustainable development in the National Planning Policy Framework.
19. D2N2 LEP's support is noted.
20. National Grid's support is noted.
21. Objections to the Plan are noted.
22. In response to CPC a 0.5ha threshold for site allocations is considered appropriate for a Local Plan and other policies manage smaller site development.
23. In response to Placedynamix, the level of growth provided for in the Plan is required to meet the provision of the adopted Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies.
24. NTU support is noted.
25. NLAF support is noted.
26. In response to BGNCC (NCC), the Development Principles have been amended to reflect the comment.

section four Development Management Policies – Places For People	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded 1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)	

Summary of Comments

1. NAG supports the principles of Section 4: Development Management Policies – Places for People.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the Policy is noted.

section five Development Management Policies – Our Environment	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT supports the Policy.
2. LNP suggests an addition to paragraph 5.2 of the Justification Text of the Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the Policy is noted.
2. In response to Local Nature Partnership, it is believed that the current Justification Text of Policy EN6 sufficiently addresses the comments made in the representation.

Section six Development Management Policies – Making it Happen	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3490 – Tom Huggon - Open and Green Spaces Champion (OSGC)	

Summary of Comments

1. OSGC suggests amending paragraph 6.15 stating a list of criteria to assess greenfield sites against before allocating them.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to OSGC, the criteria currently present in paragraph 6.15 are examples and not an extensive list. It is believed that the criteria proposed in the comment have been addressed through the Sustainability Appraisal and the Development Principles.

Policies Map Changes	
Number of Consultees - 6	Number of Responses - 12
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>3529 – Health and Safety Executive (HSE) 3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response) 3726 – Aldi Stores 3727 - Marstons 3739 – Land Securities PLC 3741 – Tesco Stores</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. HSE recommends marking the areas where there are major hazard establishments and major accident hazard pipelines on the Policies Map.
2. **LNP supports the Policies Map but notices that Air Quality Management Areas are not included.**
3. LNP enquires if the mineral safeguarding map applies to safeguarding of hydrocarbons assets.
4. Aldi Stores suggests expanding the Centre of Neighbourhood Importance to include Castle Retail Park.
5. Marstons and Tesco Stores suggest removing the Open Space Designation from the Policies Map.
6. LSPC suggests including the Cornerhouse in the Secondary Shopping Frontage.
7. LSPC objects the proposed public open space on South Sherwood St/Burton St, as it will affect the operations of the Cornerhouse.
8. LSPC notices that Secondary Shopping Frontages are not shown on the Policies Map and that it is not clear which part of the Primary Shopping area is covered in this Policy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to HSE, the elements mentioned are already marked on the Policies Map.
2. **In response to LNP Air Quality Management Areas have been added to the Policies Map.**
3. In response to LNP, hydrocarbon assets are not included on the Policies Map but in the Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence Areas.
4. In response to Aldi Stores, the definition of centres in the National Planning Policy Framework does not justify the inclusion of the area.
5. In response to Marstons and Tesco Stores, the Policies Map is amended to reflect the comment.
6. In response to Land Securities PLC, the Cornerhouse is already a secondary shopping frontage, as all frontages within the Primary Shopping Area that are not Primary Shopping Frontages are defined as secondary Shopping Frontages.

7. In response to Land Securities PLC, the proposed public space is only indicative. Proposals will be subject to consultation and will consider the needs of existing businesses.
8. In response to Land Securities PLC, all other frontages in the Primary Shopping Area which are not Primary Shopping Frontages are identified as Secondary Shopping Frontages.

Omission Sites	
Number of Consultees - 6	Number of Responses - 27
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>1825 – J Lowe (New Aspley Gardenholders Ltd) 2659 – Archer R 3073 – David Savidge 3215 – Fretwell R 3705 – Jockey Club 3722 – ABB Limited</p>	

Summary of Comment

1. New Aspley Gardenholders Ltd and three different residents suggest allocating the New Aspley Gardens for development.
2. A resident supports the identification of New Aspley Gardens as an allotment site.
3. Jockey Club suggests including the Racecourse site in the list of allocated sites.
4. ABB Ltd suggests including the Wilford Road/Queens Road site, or including it within the Canal Quarter, otherwise the Local Plan would be inconsistent with National Planning Policy as it would prevent development of the site.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to New Aspley Gardenholders Ltd, the sites scored poorly on the many SA objectives, are part of the open space network and development here would result in adverse impact upon biodiversity and health. It is therefore not considered appropriate to allocate New Aspley Gardens for development.
2. Support for the omission of New Aspley Gardens is noted.
3. In response to the Jockey Club, the Open Space Network designation has been amended in light of their comments but sites are allocated only where there are proposals for significant changes. It is believed that existing policies in the LAPP make adequate provision to support development that enhances the Racecourse site and other sporting facilities of similar status are not specifically mentioned in the LAPP for the same reason.
4. In response to ABB limited, the land is understood to be in active employment use which is appropriate for this site. Should employment use cease, then other policies would allow for appropriate redevelopment without need to allocation this site. The boundary of the Canal Quarter focuses on the City Centre where it is anticipated significant change will occur over the plan period.

Omission Policies	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 5
List of Consultees who responded 0225 – Pedals 3705 – Jockey Club 3722 – ABB Limited 3724 – The Bridge Steering Group 3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals, the Bridge Steering Group and NLAF suggest considering a foot and cycle bridge between Trent Lane and Hook (Lady Bay), mentioning the advantages it will bring and the preparation and consultation work performed so far to make it possible.
2. Jockey Club requests a Policy recognising the importance and role of the Racecourse.
3. ABB Ltd suggests allocating land at Wilford/Queen Drive for development and included in the regeneration area.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to Pedals, the Bridge Steering Group and Nottingham Local Access Forum, Policy RE8 makes provision for improving linkages between the City Centre and adjoining neighbourhood, but considering there is still no firm proposal or funding in place it is believed to be premature to go beyond the proposed policy approach.
2. In response to Jockey Club, it is believed that the existing policies can adequately manage development of Racecourse site.
3. In response to ABB Ltd, the land is understood to be in active employment use which is appropriate for this site. Should employment use cease, then other policies would allow for appropriate redevelopment without need to allocation this site.

4.

Miscellaneous Comments	
Number of Consultees - 5	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded	
0188 – Mr J Potter 0225 – Pedals 3490 – Tom Huggon -Open Spaces Champion Group (OSCG) 3530 – Highways England (HE) 3692 – Danuta Reszuya	

Summary of Comment

1. A resident expresses disappointment for not having been directly consulted.
2. Pedals notes the importance of consulting with Nottinghamshire City Council, HE, Rushcliffe Borough Councils, Sustrans.
3. OSCG notices that schemes should include Emerald and Green Necklaces.
4. HE notes that its principal interest is the safeguarding of the A52.
5. A resident requests to be kept informed on the future stages of the development of the Local Plan.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Consultation on the Land and Planning Policies Document was wide ranging, robust and in complete conformity with the Councils Statement of Community Involvement.
2. Pedals' comments are noted.
3. In response to OSCG, the Strategy for Open Spaces took account of the Breathing Space Strategy and its actions plans, including the Emerald and Green Necklaces.
4. HE comment is noted.
5. Resident request to be kept informed noted.

Irrelevant to Local Plan	
Number of Consultees - 4	Number of Responses - 5
List of Consultees who responded	
0188 – Potter J	
2409 – Friends of Victoria Embankment (FoVE) - (Late response)	
3681 – Shaun Worley	
3752 – Anonymous Resident	

Summary of Comments

1. A resident mentions that something should be set up to deal with environment/democracy/planning complaints. It is also suggested to scrutinize the recent environmental impact to the local area and to consider the impact devolution deal would have on marginalization of local residents.
2. A resident expresses dissatisfaction regarding the sale and development at High Pavement site.
3. FoVE raise some concerns on the way Victoria Embankment will be improved and managed.
4. A resident expresses dissatisfaction toward the development at High Pavement site in the past.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Resident comments regarding a system for dealing with environmental/democratic/planning complaints are noted, but are not considered a matter for the Land and Planning Policies Document.
2. Residents comment regarding the sale of High Pavement are noted, but are not considered a matter for the Land and Planning Policies Document.
3. In response to FoVE, comment is noted and passed to the Park and Open Space department, but it is not a matter for the Land and Planning Policies Document.
4. Resident comments regarding the development at High Pavement are noted, but are not considered a matter for the Land and Planning Policies Document.

Housing Background Paper	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 9
List of Consultees who responded	
2795 – Home Builders Federation (HBF) 3689 – Calverton Parish Council (CPC)	

Summary of Comment

1. HBF requests clarification if the 2012-based Household projections are in line with the Core Strategy housing provision. The Plan should confirm the position.
2. HBF notes that the housing supply is just slightly higher than the expected requirement, and proposes more flexibility.
3. CPC believes capacity of brownfield sites is underestimated and requirement for other Districts could be reduced.
4. CPC mentions that Housing Land Availability Assessment windfall allowance is based on data from 2008-13, a period of low completions. The allowance should be increased by 1,125.
5. CPC believes City Centre capacity is underestimated.
6. CPC believes that there is opportunity to deliver additional dwellings in the University Campuses.
7. CPC believes that there is opportunity to deliver additional dwellings in vacant pubs and flats above shops.
8. CPC believes that the distribution park at J24 on the M1 and the 40 hectares of employment land around the HS2 station in Broxtowe will reduce the demand for employment land in Nottingham.

Summary of Nottingham City Council response

1. In response to HBF, The Sustainable Mixed and Inclusive Communities Background Paper confirms no review of the Core Strategy is required at the present time as a result of the 2012-based household projections.
2. In response to HBF, the Housing Land Availability Assessment defining housing need and housing supply is considered adequate to meet housing requirements with a significant buffer for non-delivery.
3. In response to CPC, the capacity of brownfield sites is considered adequate and development of brownfield sites is supported through various tools. Review of housing requirements in Nottingham City will entail a review of the Core Strategy and the comment does not relate to the Land and Planning Policies Document.
4. In response to CPC it is noted that the data will be updated in the revision of the Housing Land Availability Assessment.
5. In response to CPC, the City Centre capacity only includes sites over 0.5 hectare and does not represent the overall capacity.

6. In response to CPC, the Universities have no intention of building additional dwellings in the Campuses.
7. In response to CPC, vacant pubs and flats above shops have been included in SHLAA and/or the windfall allowance as appropriate.
8. In response to CPC, these issues are reflected in the mix of sites allocated for employment purposes which has taken into account the need for employment land on a conurbation basis. Also, employment land around the HS2 station will not be operational within the Plan period.

Green Belt Background Paper	
Number of Consultees - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded 2989 – Ashfield District Council (ADC) 3705 – Jockey Club	

Summary of Comments

- ADC supports the Policy.
- Jockey Club supports the inclusion of the Racetrack within the Green Belt.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

- Support for the Policy is noted.
- Support for the Policy is noted.

Transport Background Paper	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comment

1. NLAF supports the ambitions of the Transport Background Paper.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the Transport Background Paper is noted.

Site Assessment Background Paper	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3653 – Veolia	

Summary of Comments

1. Veolia believes that the background document fails to recognise the significance of the waste management facility on Freeth Street.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to Veolia, the recognition of the significance of the facility is not within the remit of the Site Assessment Background Paper, which only sets the methodology for allocation.

Minerals Background Paper	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC)	

Summary of Comments

1. Notts CC supports the approach to Minerals management in the Core Strategy as well as Policy IN2, MI1, MI2 and MI3.
2. Notts CC agrees with the approach demonstrated in the Minerals Background Paper.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support for the Policies and to the Minerals Background Paper is noted.
2. Comments noted.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3653 – Veolia	

Summary of Comments

1. Veolia believes that the supporting background document did not capture the real importance of the waste management facility on Freeth Street.

Summary of Nottingham City Council response

1. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan assessment of waste management facilities is considerate sufficiently thorough.

Sustainability Appraisal	
Number of Consultees - 4	Number of Responses - 14
List of Consultees who responded 0188 – Mr J Potter 0311 – Historic England (HE) 0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 3215 – Raymond Fretwell	

Summary of Comments

1. The Sustainability Appraisal should address the issue of long views and river landscape.
2. HE suggests amending the subjective lines in the Objective 3 Heritage of the Horizon Factory site.
3. NWT agrees with the Sustainability Appraisal.
4. A resident argues that the SA score of New Aspley Gardens is underestimated in several objectives and that comparison with other sites shows inconsistencies and inbuilt bias.

Summary of Nottingham City Council

1. The Sustainability Appraisal addresses long view through the Landscape and Townscape objective.
2. In response to HE, the wording of the Objective 3 Heritage of the Horizon Factory site has been amended to reflect the comment.
3. Support for the Sustainability Appraisal is noted.
4. The Sustainability Appraisal is considered a robust assessment and consistent to all sites. The Sustainability Appraisal scores for the New Aspley Gardens site are considered accurate.

Equality Impact Assessment	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 5
List of Consultees who responded	
1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement (NDPM)	

Summary of Comments

1. NDPM suggests including breakdown of disability, gender and race of figures in paragraph 3.72 of the Equality Impact Assessment.
2. NDPM believes that the Assessment does not refer to employment opportunities for disabled people in the same way it refers to listed black minority ethnic community and women.
3. NDPM mentioned that the Assessment does not make reference to the barrier to disabled and older people created by pedestrianisation.
4. NDPM notices that the Policy HOU1 does not make reference to positive impact for disabled people.
5. NDPM notices Policy DE3 could put disabled people at disadvantage.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to NDPM the Equality Impact Assessment has been amended to contain breakdown of figures in para 3.72.
2. In response to NDPM the Assessment has been amended to address employment opportunities for disabled people.
3. In response to NDPM the Assessment has been amended to address barriers created by pedestrianisation.
4. In response to NDPM Policy the Assessment has been amended to mention the comment on policy HOU1.
5. In response to NDPM Policy the Assessment has been amended to mention the comment on policy DE3.

Duty To Cooperate	
Number of Consultees - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3545 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP) - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. LNP mentions having no record of being consulted on the Land and Planning Policies Preferred Option.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. In response to LNP, a consultation letter was sent to Heather Stokes send on 25 November 2013. The letter was followed up on 18 December 2013, but no response was received. On 11 August 2015 an email was received from Rosy Carter requesting to be added to consultation database in place of Heather Stokes.

Figure 3 Representations at Publication Stage by Site.

Site	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses
PA1 Bestwood Road - Former Bestwood Day Centre	3	3
PA2 Blenheim Lane	3	3
PA3 Eastglade, Top Valley – Former Eastglade School Site	3	4
PA4 Linby Street/Filey Street	3	4
PA5 Ridgeway – Former Padstow School Detached Playing Field	4	20
PA6 Beckhampton Road – Former Padstow School Detached Playing Field	9	28
PA7 Hucknall Road/Southglade Road – Southglade Food Park	3	3
PA8 Eastglade Road – Former Padstow School Site	6	9
PA9 Edwards Lane – Former Haywood School Detached Playing Field	5	7
PA10 Piccadilly – Former Henry Mellish School Playing Field	4	9
PA11 Stanton Tip – Hempshill Vale	3	4
PA12 Highbury Road – Former Henry Mellish School Site	1	1
PA13 Edwards Lane – Former Haywood School Site	1	1
PA14 Arnside Road – Former Chronos Richardson	1	2
PA15 Bulwell Lane – Former Coach Depot	0	0
PA16 Woodhouse Way – Nottingham Business Park North	1	1
PA17 Woodhouse Way – Woodhouse Park	1	1
PA18 Vernon Road – Former Johnsons Dyeworks	7	8
PA19 – Lortas Road	2	2
PA20 Haydn Road/Hucknall Road – Severn Trent Water Depot	1	3

Site	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses
PA21 Mansfield Road – Sherwood Library	6	16
PA22 Western Boulevard	3	3
PA23 Radford Road -Former Basford Gasworks	2	2
PA24 College Way – Melbury School Playing Field	17	17
PA25 Chingford Road Playing Field	12	15
PA26 Denewood Crescent – Denewood Centre	0	0
PA27 Wilkinson Street – Former PZ Cussons	4	4
PA28 Ransom Road – Hine Hall	3	6
PA29 Bobbers Mill Bridge – Land Adjacent to Bobbers Mill Industrial Estate	1	1
PA30 Bobbers Mill Bridge – Bobbers Mill Industrial Estate	5	6
PA31 Ascot Road – Speedo	0	0
PA32 Beechdale Road – South of Former Co-op Dairy	2	2
PA33 Chalfont Drive – Former Government Buildings	3	3
PA34 Beechdale Road – Former Beechdale Baths	2	2
PA35 Woodyard Lane - Siemens	1	1
PA36 Russell Drive – Radford Bridge Allotments	2	3
PA37 Robin Hood Chase	0	0
PA38 Carlton Road – Former Castle College	1	8
PA39 Carlton Road – Former Albany Works Site and Co-op	1	4
PA40 Daleside Road – Former Colwick Service Station	1	1
PA41 Alfreton Road – Forest Mill	3	4
PA42 Ilkeston Road – Radford Mill	4	5
PA43 Salisbury Street	3	3
PA44 Derby Road – Sandfield Centre	5	8

Site	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses
PA45 Prospect Place	1	4
PA46 Derby Road – Former Hillside Club	2	6
PA47 Abbey Street/Leengate	5	7
PA48 Queens Drive – Land adjacent to the Portal	0	0
PA49 NG2 West – Enterprise Way	1	4
PA50 NG2 South – Queens Drive	0	0
PA51 Riverside Way	1	1
PA52 University Boulevard – Nottingham Science and Technology Park	0	0
PA53 Electric Avenue	1	1
PA54 Boots	6	6
PA55 Ruddington Lane – Rear of 107 - 127	1	1
PA56 Sturgeon Avenue – The Spinney	3	3
PA57 Clifton West	17	51
PA58 Green Lane – Fairham House	2	2
PA59 Farnborough Road – Former Fairham Comprehensive School	10	19
PA60 Victoria Centre	2	2
PA61 Royal Quarter – Burton Street, Guildhall, Police Station and Fire Station	4	9
PA62 Creative Quarter – Brook Street East	1	3
PA63 Creative Quarter – Brook Street West	1	1
PA64 Creative Quarter – Sneinton Market	1	1
PA65 Creative Quarter – Bus Depot	2	2
PA66 Castle Quarter, Maid Marian Way – College Site	3	3
PA67 Broadmarsh Centre	3	6

Site	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses
PA68 Canal Quarter – Island Site	5	5
PA69 Canal Quarter – Station Street/Carrington Street	3	3
PA70 Canal Quarter – Queens Road, East of Nottingham Station	2	8
PA71 Canal Quarter – Sheriffs Way, Sovereign House	0	0
PA72 Canal Quarter – Waterway Street	0	0
PA73 Canal Quarter – Sheriffs Way/Arkwright Street	0	0
PA74 Canal Quarter – Arkwright Street	2	2
PA75 Canal Quarter – Crocus Street, Southpoint	0	0
PA76 Waterside – London road, Former Hartwells	3	3
PA77 Waterside – London Road, Eastcroft Depot	3	3
PA78 Waterside – London Road, South of Eastcroft Depot	3	3
PA79 Waterside – Iremonger Road	2	2
PA80 Waterside – Cattle Market	2	2
PA81 Waterside – Meadow Lane	5	7
PA82 Waterside – Freeth Street	4	4
PA83 Waterside – Daleside Road, Trent Lane Basin	4	4
PA84 Waterside – Daleside Road, Eastpoint	1	1
PA85 Waterside – Trent Lane, Park Yacht Club	2	2
PA86 Thane Road – Horizon Factory	13	30

Individual Site Representations Summaries

PA1 Bestwood Road – Former Bestwood Day Centre	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group) (OSCG) 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT states that the site accounts for three Local Wildlife Sites, mature trees, common lizards and toads that occur locally and hence considered a sensitive site in terms of biodiversity.
2. OSCG consider that sufficient brownfield sites are available which are underused and can satisfy requirements for relevant kinds of development without interfering with these greenfield and partially greenfield sites.
3. NLAF consider the site should be assessed for biodiversity, importance as part of greenfield network and accessibility before allocation.

Summary of LA Response

1. Development Principles make reference to the scope to focus development on area of low flood risk and provide enhanced GI on areas of highest flood risk with creation of green corridors to link to Local Wildlife sites.
2. Allocation of this brownfield site is required to help to meet the Council's objectively assessed housing need. The site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to a Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies.
3. Development Principles make reference to the scope to provide enhanced GI and create green corridors to link to Local Wildlife sites. Access issues will be determined through the Development Management process as proposals for development come forward.

PA2 Blenheim Lane	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champion Group) (OSCG) 3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT comments that the Development Principles mentions Bulwell Hall Park but not Hucknall Airfield and considers this to be a sensitive site as it accounts for numerous local wildlife sites and an SSSI (Bulwell Wood) close by. Support the protection/enhancement of the southern boundary hedge.
2. OSCG comments that sufficient brownfield sites are available which are underused and can satisfy requirements for Housing and considers allocating greenfield and partially greenfield sites like these would divert development from brownfield sites resulting in loss of open space and delays in regeneration areas. They should also be assessed against its value for biodiversity, importance as part of the green network and accessibility from where people live based on the “Breathing Space” standards before allocation.
3. NLAF support inclusion of vehicular access from Firth Way.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Allocation of this site, alongside many brownfield sites, is required to help to meet the Council’s employment land need. The site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to a Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies. The Development Principles reflect the current planning permission for the site which considered all adjacent designated sites.
2. Allocation of this site reflects the current planning permission for the site. The proposed employment /energy production use would be compatible with nearby uses, subject to an acceptable layout/ treatment, including to the boundary with the adjacent golf course to the north. The Development Principles require opportunities to protect and enhance Blenheim Lane Hedgerows and Bulwell Hall Park Local Wildlife Sites close by. In addition, soft landscaping and retained or replacement hedgerow planting around the boundary should be incorporated to compensate for loss of semi-natural wildlife.
3. Support noted.

PA3 Eastglade, Top Valley – Former Eastglade School Site	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 0838 – Sport England (SE) 3490 - Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group)</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT welcomes retention of a proportion of site as open space and seeks clarification of as to how improvement of local LWS/LNRs, mentioned in Development Principles, will be achieved.
2. SE raises no objection to the disposal of the site, the loss of which has been fully considered as part of the Nottingham City Playing Pitch Strategy 2015, and supports appropriate development contributions being sought to invest in the improvement of new or existing sport facilities.
3. A representative of Open Space Champions Group mentions that the site is currently greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. It is suggested to assess the site against its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles set out that appropriate mitigation could be offsite hence the reference to improvement of local LWS/LNRs.
2. The site is a part brownfield site, formerly a school, it is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies, among which Sport England. Provision for a green corridor, new allotments, or play areas has been included in the Development Principles Text.
3. The Development Principles include a requirement that development should include mitigation measures which result in an overall increase in the quality and ecological value of open space in the area.

PA4 Linby Street/Filey Street	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded 0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 1540 – Environment Agency (EA) 3006 – N Wootton	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT welcomes the semi-natural habitat buffer area along the eastern boundary to protect and enhance the adjacent River Leen Local Wildlife Site, and requests measures to fund its management in perpetuity.
2. EA supports the approach taken by NCC in considering best future options for this strategic site, but comments that flood risk concern is still relevant.
3. A resident considers the site should not be allocated for retail development as Bulwell has sufficient shops, many empty. Considers an area of semi-natural habitat could be created along the eastern boundary.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Management of the buffer has already been dealt with through a planning permission covering most of the site.
2. The Environment Agency's support is noted. Development Principles require a site specific flood risk assessment.
3. Consistent with the Core Strategy the Local Plan is trying to upgrade Bulwell from a District Centre to a Town Centre, so employment, housing and retail are appropriate uses. The Development Principles do state that a buffer area of semi-natural habitat should be created along the eastern boundary.

PA5 Ridgeway – Former Padstow School Detached Playing Field	
Number of Respondents - 4	Number of Responses - 20
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) 3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group - OSCG) 3529 – Health and Safety Executive 3658 – Gemma Campbell</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT welcomes proposal to retain proportion of site as open space but notes that the Development Principles mention improvement of local LWS/LNRs and the nearest is almost 1km to the north.
2. OSCG states that the site is currently greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. Suggest site is assessed against its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.
3. HSE states that the site encroaches on the outer zone of a major accident hazard pipeline.
4. Resident objects to the site being allocated because view of field will be lost, construction work will cause disturbance and possible damage, flood risk may be increased, access will be lost, green space will be lost, light, privacy and value of house will be reduced, traffic, noise and risk of crime will be increased and boundary maintenance will be hindered. There is no need for further housing in this densely populated area. The community will benefit more if the site is kept undeveloped.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles set out that appropriate mitigation could be offsite hence the reference to improvement of local LWS/LNRs.
2. The site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies, among which Sport England. Provision for a green corridor, new allotments, and play areas has been included in the Development Principles Text.
3. Comments noted. Development Principles state that prior consultation is required.
4. Allocation of this site, alongside many brownfield sites, is required to help to meet the Council's objectively assessed housing need. Details of Design and Layout will be carefully considered at the planning application stage as will control of construction traffic etc. Other concerns raised are neither relevant to the Local Plan nor material planning considerations.

PA6 Beckhampton Road – Former Padstow School Detached Playing Field	
Number of Respondents - 9	Number of Responses - 28
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
0838 – Sport England (SE)	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group)(OSCG)	
3529 – Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	
3716 – Glynis Garton	
3750 – Brailsford	
3754 – Robert Elliott	
3755 – Nicholas Pearson	
3760 – Michael Hanby	
3681 – Shaun Worley	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT welcome the opportunity to improve the biodiversity value of the site and retain much of it as open space.
2. HSE states that the site encroaches on the outer zone of a major accident hazard pipeline.
3. SE raises no objection and supports appropriate developer contributions being sought to be invested into the improvement of new or existing sport facilities. Supports allocation as Community Sports Hub.
4. OSCG consider the site is greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. Suggest the site be assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.
5. Local residents raise concerns and/or objections to the allocation of the site for residential development. Concerns/comments include:
 - Loss of the playing field which serves as recreational space for the local community;
 - Loss of outlook on to open space;
 - Loss of views of the countryside;
 - Overlooking and loss of privacy;
 - Inadequacy of local roads to cope with additional traffic and parking;
 - Additional strain being placed on drains and sewers;
 - Consultation with the Health and Safety Executive in relation to the

- Hazardous Installation Consultation Zone may be inadequate;
- Space should be used for recreational purposes only, as a landscaped park for all to use and enjoy;
- The area was parkland/green belt and should not to be built on;
- There to be no need for a further sports centre in the area in addition to the existing provision at Southglade.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support of NWT noted.
2. HSE prior notification referenced in Development Principles.
3. SE comments/support noted.
4. The site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies, among which Sport England. Provision for a green corridor, new allotments, and play areas has been included in the Development Principles Text. The site is not located within the Green Belt. The development principles set out that the layout of the former school playing field site should maximise opportunities to accommodate a range of sporting activities to support local needs. The principles also identify potential for a small element of residential use, depending on final layout.
5. Regarding amenity concerns raised by local residents, the plan simply gives an indication in principle of what could be developed on the site. Details of development proposals will be managed through the development management process. Concerns regarding the loss of views and outlook are not material planning considerations. The Adopted Local Plan expected 34 dwellings on this site, but the emerging Plan indicates a range of 0 to 25 dwellings, with the majority of the site given over to open space and a community sports hub. It is considered the quantum of development proposed can in principle be accommodated on the existing highway network with further assessment at the detailed design stage. The Development Principles set out the need for careful consideration of parking in order to avoid detrimental impact on existing properties. The plan is subject to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, prepared in consultation with service providers. It is considered that the quantum of development proposed can be accommodated without serious detriment to existing infrastructure and services but with further detailed assessment and confirmation of any mitigation measures to take place at planning application stage.

PA7 Hucknall Road/Southglade Road – Southglade Food Park	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group)(OSCG)	
3529 – Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT observes that this is a 'private nature reserve' which may have some ecological interest, and that it buffers and extends the designated Hucknall Road Linear Walkway Local Nature Reserves (LNR). Asks for careful consideration of any impact on that LNR.
2. OSCG mentions that the site is currently greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. They suggest the site be assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.
3. HSE states that the site encroaches on the inner and outer zones of a major accident hazard pipeline.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site, which is near Hucknall Road Linear Walkway LNR, but is not connected to it, is owned by Nottingham City Council and retained for regeneration and redevelopment. Any biodiversity interest will be considered at the planning application stage.
2. The site is a brownfield site and it is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies.
3. The need for prior consultation is included in the Development Principles.

PA8 Eastglade Road – Former Padstow School Site	
Number of Respondents - 6	Number of Responses - 9
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
0838 - Sport England (SE)	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group) (OSCG)	
3746 – Petition	
3748 – Linda Hall	
3752 – Anonymous Resident	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT states that site is adjacent to a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Local Wildlife Site (LWS), and asks for retention of much open space and strong links to the LNR and LWS, and for appropriate management agreements.
2. SE supports the proposed allocation, which has been fully considered as part of the Nottingham City Playing Pitch Strategy 2015, and supports appropriate developer contributions being sought for investment in the improvement of new or existing sport facilities.
3. OSCG mentions that the site is currently greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. It suggests the site be assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.
4. 175 people have signed a petition requesting alteration of the development boundary to exclude the Bestwood Estate Community Centre and its grounds.
5. Supports building houses on the site.
6. Objects to development of the site, considering that it should remain as green open space for recreation.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Development Principles require mitigation measures resulting in an overall increase in the quality and ecological value of open space in the area, and identify linking of new green space to Sunrise Hill LNR and buffering this LNR as a key priority.
2. Sport England's support is noted.
3. The site is partially brownfield and it is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies, among which Sport England. Provision for a green corridor, new allotments, or play areas have been included in the Development Principles Text. A significant proportion of the site is to be retained as open space.

4. Amendment of the site boundary is not considered necessary as the development principles for the site state that this is to be retained or relocated in a suitable and appropriate location within the site.
5. Support noted.
6. The site is partially brownfield and it is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies, among which Sport England. Provision for a green corridor, new allotments, or play areas has been included in the Development Principles Text. A significant proportion of the site is to be retained as open space.

PA9 Edwards Lane – Former Haywood School Detached Playing Field	
Number of Respondents - 5	Number of Responses - 7
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
0838 - Sport England (SE)	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group)(OSCG)	
3710 – James Thorpe	
3732 – Lynne Simpson	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT requests that strong, habitat-rich Green Infrastructure links should be created with Sandy Banks Local Nature Reserve (LNR).
2. SE raises no objection to the proposed allocation, which has been fully considered as part of the Nottingham City Playing Pitch Strategy 2015, and supports appropriate developer contributions being sought for investment in the improvement of new or existing sport facilities.
3. OSCG mentions that the site is currently greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. Suggests the site be assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.
4. Two local residents are opposed to this allocation is concerned about the loss of a playing area for children, noise and security issues during construction and concerned about the loss of a playing area for children, loss of a view, and devaluation of houses.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The development will be required to include mitigation measures to increase the quality and ecological value of open space in the area.
2. SE's comments are noted.
3. The site is a playing field, and it is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies, among which Sport England. Provision for a green corridor, new allotments, or play areas has been included in the Development Principles Text.
4. The site consists of former school playing fields no longer required for that purpose, and identified as suitable for the development of family housing - a City Council priority. Residential amenity will be protected through the Development Management process. The development principles include the retention and creation of open space. The value of land/property is not a material planning consideration.

PA10 Piccadilly – Former Henry Mellish School Playing Field	
Number of Respondents - 4	Number of Responses - 9
List of Consultees who responded	
0838 – Sport England (SE)	
2758 – Rev Gerry Murphy	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group) (OSCG)	
3764 – Poor Clare Monastery (PCM) - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. SE raises no objection to the disposal of the site.
2. A new community centre is currently being built next to the site and that football matches in the nearby facilities create noise issue on Sunday. The site is in close proximity to the Poor Clare Monastery and that development can cause disruption to their contemplative way of life.
3. OSCG states that the site is currently greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. They suggest the site be assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.
4. Provision should be made in the Development Principles to the boundary wall with the Monastery, the height and position of buildings, parking on Brooklyn Road and noise from open space.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Comments noted.
2. The Development Principles text has been amended to reflect the presence of the Monastery and to make provision for maintaining tranquillity in the area.
3. The site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies, among which Sport England. Provision for a green corridor, new allotments, and play areas has been included in the Development Principles Text.
4. The Development Principles text has been amended to cover these concerns as far as practicable. Detailed design and layout issues etc. will be considered as part of the Development Management process.

PA11 Stanton Tip – Hempshill Vale	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group)(OSCG)	
3530 – Highways England (HE)	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT states that the site has been designated as a Local Wildlife Site and it is of relevant biodiversity importance. Suggests site be retained as a biodiversity resource and recreational facility. If the site is to be developed, suggest retaining the Local Wildlife Site and a green corridor.
2. OPCG states that the site is currently greenfield, and that its development would divert development from brownfield sites. It suggests the site is assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.
3. HE welcomes the inclusion of a reference to the need of a Transport Assessment.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site is brownfield, identified in the Core Strategy, and is considered wholly suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies. Its development will enable its remediation. The biodiversity value of the site is recognised and the Development Principles make provision for enhancing and creating opportunity within and outside the sites. In addition, paragraph 3.183 of the Justification Text has been amended to make reference to the biodiversity value and need to preserve habitat.
2. The site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies, among which Sport England. Provision for a green corridor, new allotments, and play areas has been included in the Development Principles text.
3. Comments noted.

PA12 Highbury Road – Former Henry Mellish School Site	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group)(OSCG)	

Summary of Comments

1. OSCG states that the site is currently greenfield or partially greenfield, and that its development would divert development from brownfield sites. It suggests the site is assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site is a brownfield site. Planning permission for a new school granted in October 2014 and this has now been built. Accordingly, the extent of the site has been reduced to reflect this. The remaining site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and consultation with statutory bodies.

PA13 Edwards Lane – Former Haywood School Site	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group)(OSCG)	

Summary of Comments

1. OSCG states that the site is currently greenfield or partially greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. It suggests the site is assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site is a brownfield site with Planning Permission for residential development which is under construction. The site is therefore no-longer proposed to be allocated.

PA14 Arnside Road – Former Chronos Richardson	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
3752 – Anonymous Resident	

Summary of Comments

1. The site should be accessed off Belconnen Road, and that development should be limited to 2 storey in height.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles give an indication of what could be developed on the site. Detailed issue such as access and building heights will be addressed through the development management process.

PA15 Bulwell Lane – Former Coach Depot	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

PA16 Woodhouse Way – Nottingham Business Park North	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
2813 – Wilson Bowden	

Summary of Comment

1. Use class A1/A3/A4 should be permitted in the south-eastern parcel of the site to promote employment generation.

Summary of Nottingham City Council

1. The north-eastern parcel has been removed from this allocation in order to safeguard the route of HS2. Development Principles have been amended to specify use classes A1/A3/A4 in the remaining south-eastern parcel.

PA17 Woodhouse Way – Woodhouse Park	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. Nottingham Local Access Forum suggests that the Development Principles should refer to the opportunity to improve cycling and walking connection.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site is currently under construction and such matters have been dealt with through the development management process.

PA18 Vernon Road – Former Johnsons Dyeworks	
Number of Respondents - 7	Number of Responses - 8
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
1540 – Environment Agency (EA)	
3529 – Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	
2353 – John Moon	
3660 – Tassadaque Masood	
3668 – Tricia Wright	
3749 – Stella & Alan Walker	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT suggests that the 8 meters proposed strip be increased to 15.
2. The Environment Agency notes the importance of the site from a Flood Risk Perspective.
3. Health and Safety Executive states that the site overlaps with a major accident hazard site.
4. Residents suggest that provision be made for adequate parking and for flood prevention. Access to the site should be located on Vernon Road. The site has been vacant for some time and residential development (not in the form of apartment or flats), employment use and sporting facilities are welcomed. Concerned about traffic generation, schools and sewer capacity and that industry is proposed.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The 8 meters is a minimum, as required by the Environment Agency. Precise details will be determined through the development management process when the Wildlife Trust will be engaged further.
2. Comment is noted, reference is made to the need for a Flood Risk Assessment and flood risk mitigation measures in the Development Principles.
3. The Development Principles refer to the need for prior consultation
4. Parking and access consideration will be detailed through planning application as part of the development management process. It is considered the quantum of development proposed can in principle be accommodated on the existing highway network. Access is likely to be off Vernon Road and off Fox Grove/White Road. In respect of flood risk prevention, the Development Principles contain reference to the problem and the Council is identifying funding to secure flood mitigation/management works. An 8 metre strip adjacent to the water course will need to be kept free and other measures will be

required to facilitate flood risk management. The site is allocated for residential use C3 and compatible employment use (B1) Sporting facilities are not proposed.

PA19 – Lortas Road	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group)	
3529 - Health and Safety Executive	

Summary of Comment

1. OSCG states that the site is currently greenfield or partially greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. They suggest the site is assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.
2. Health and Safety Executive states that the site encroaches on the outer zone of a major accident hazard pipeline.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site has Planning Permission for residential development. It is considered suitable for development and has been subject to Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and consultation with statutory bodies. The Development Principles state that development should include on site public open space which is overlooked, secure and well integrated.
2. The Development Principles state that prior consultation is required.

PA20 Haydn Road/Hucknall Road – Severn Trent Water Depot	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
3765 – Severn Trent Water (STW)	

Summary of Comment

1. STW believes the expectation for 60 houses on the site is not justified by enough evidence. Suggests removal of the wording 'predominately family housing' and 'maximum figure'. Supports the allocation for residential use.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The allocation is for both employment use B1 and residential use. The figure of 60 has been substituted by a range from 60 to 80 dwellings and is considered appropriate given the number of units achieved on comparable sites. The emphasis on family housing is considered consistent with Core Strategy Policy 8 which seeks to satisfy Sustainable Community Strategy and Housing Strategy Objectives. Support for this as a housing allocation is noted.

PA21 Mansfield Road – Sherwood Library	
Number of Respondents - 6	Number of Responses - 16
List of Consultees who responded	
3715 – John Holdsworth	
3721 – Julia Williams	
3751 – Mohammed Khizer (Saagar Tandoori Restaurant)	
3759 – Ken Dyke (Roots)	
3763 – Nicola Wheeler - (Late response)	
3768 – Nottingham Liberal Synagogue - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. It is important for Sherwood to have a good public library on the site.
2. There is a shortage of stores around the site.
3. A similar proposal in Mapperley had a negative impact on shops and residents.
4. Nottingham Liberal Synagogue and other residents highlighted the need for adequate parking provision and stated that Spondon Street car park is a vital facility.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles make provision for a public library on the site.
2. Comment on the shortage of stores is noted.
3. Comment on the negative impact is noted and will be considered at planning application stage.
4. The Development Principles text has been amended to ensure adequate car parking is secured as part of any development and to seek active frontages that will enhance the District Centre.

PA22 Western Boulevard	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
3529 - Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	
3742 – Michael Thompson	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. HSE states that the site encroaches on the outer zone of a major accident hazard site.
2. Travelling Showpeople currently residing on the site would like the site to be made permanent.
3. NLAF supports the opportunities for cycling and walking, but considers that opportunity for a bridge over Leen should be included.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles refer to the fact that a prior consultation is required.
2. The site would only be developed if an appropriate alternative site was found to accommodate the existing Travelling Showpeople Community. This matter has also been passed to Nottingham City Council Property Department who are responsible for the leasing of this site.
3. Comments noted. This allocation does not preclude the provision of a bridge over the river Leen.

PA23 Radford Road -Former Basford Gasworks	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
3529 - Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. Health and Safety Executive states that the site is within a major accident hazard pipeline and major accident hazard site zones.
2. NLAF supports the opportunities for cycling and walking, but considers that opportunity for a bridge over Leen should be included.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site benefits from planning permission.

PA24 College Way – Melbury School Playing Field	
Number of Respondents - 17	Number of Responses - 17
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0191 - Paul Brook 0838 – Sport England 3711 – David Baggott 3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group) 3663 – Ruki De Silva 3676 – Rebecca Greensmith 3682 – Teresa Saunders 3706 – Aurang Zeb 3708 – Melisha Francis 3709 – Leon Riddle 3713 – Michael Owen 3729 – Melbury Primary School 3735 – William Watson 3747 – Elaine Bolstridge 3753 – Timothy Strangeway 3756 – David Fordham 3757 – Alastair Smith</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. Residents stated that the development of the site may cause problems in term of increase of criminality and have a negative impact in terms of access. The site should be retained as an open space. The access road is located on College Way and could be off White Lodge Gardens or Melbury Road. Design solutions to increase safety must be adopted. Local residents were not properly informed and consulted during the Sustainability Appraisal phase. The site is not suitable for development due to waterlogging, active spring and mining activity.
2. Sport England raises no objection to the disposal of the site.
3. OSCG states that the site is currently greenfield or partially greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. They suggest the site is assessed for its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.
4. Melbury Primary School consider the site unsuitable for housing and would like to see a 10m buffer between the school and the site in order to protect vulnerable pupils. Such a buffer could be used for polytunnels.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Policies in the plan will ensure crime, safety and security are considered as part of any development proposals. Design, layout and access considerations will be detailed through planning application as part of the development management process. This site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to a Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and consultation with Sport England and other statutory bodies.

Development Principles have been written so as to ensure that design, layout, and access are carefully considered through the development management process. Letters were sent out to neighbouring residents in Broxtowe and Nottingham and site notices were placed on this development site. The Sustainability Appraisal was published on the website alongside the plan and was available at the Deposit Points.

2. Sport England's comment is noted.
3. The site is considered suitable for development and has been subject Playing Pitch Assessment in consultation with Sport England. Development Principles ensure public access to open space within the site and to existing open spaces to the north and to the west.
4. The site boundary has been reduced by 10 m to retain land for food growing/polytunnels.

PA25 Chingford Road Playing Field	
Number of Respondents - 12	Number of Responses - 15
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0122 – Cllr Malcolm Wood 0838 – Sport England 2366 – Teresa Herring 2367 – Mr & Mrs Hill 2518 – Sandra Hilton 2999 – Cllr Wendy Smith 3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group) 3654 – Domonic Townsend 3667 – Philip Herring 3677 – Christopher Bates 3683 – Mrs S Church 3684 – Marcin Welik</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. Sport England confirms that the loss of the site has been fully considered as part of the Nottingham City Playing Pitch Strategy 2015. Raises no objection to the disposal of the site and supports appropriate contributions being sought from the development provide new or improve existing sport facilities.
2. Two ward councillors and 9 other respondents object to the allocation due to concern over loss of an open green space, playing field and dog walking area. There are concerns about crime and antisocial behaviour from the new development, impact on views, traffic and access issues, loss of privacy, devaluation of existing properties, increased car parking. There are concerns that Yatesbury Crescent will become a cut through and concerns about the footpath between 91 and 93 Yatesbury Crescent. Alongside development of Denewood there are concerns that the area will become over developed with adverse impacts on heritage and local infrastructure including doctors surgery
3. Concerned about both individual and cumulative loss of greenfield or partially greenfield sites which contribute to the Open Space Network and that there are sufficient brownfield or underused sites that could satisfy housing requirements. If greenfield (or part greenfield) sites are allocated for development, this will divert development from brownfield sites resulting in loss of the open space and delays in regenerating areas. Before any greenfield site is allocated, the site should be assessed against its value for biodiversity, importance as part of the green network and accessibility from where people live based on the “Breathing Space” standards.
4. Concern is expressed about noise, dust and vibration issues during construction and impact on services such as water and waste.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Comments noted.
2. Allocation of this site, alongside many brownfield sites, is required to help to meet the
3. Council's objectively assessed housing need. The site is considered suitable for residential development including publicly accessible on site open space and has been subject to a Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and consultation with Sport England and other statutory bodies. Initial screening has shown that the site is not located in an area of sports pitch deficiency and therefore Sport England have confirmed there is no impediment to its development as nearby parks and open spaces have capacity for future increases in demand for pitches. The Development Principles have been amended to require that at least a third of the site is retained as publicly accessible open space. Development Principles require that design, layout and access should be carefully considered to avoid adverse impacts on existing residential properties. Development Principles now require a large proportion of the site to be retained as open space. This could be incorporated into multi-purpose greenspace and may provide opportunities to create a buffer to aid protection of the setting of nearby heritage assets.
4. Relevant issues will be considered at planning application stage.

PA26 Danewood Crescent – Danewood Centre	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

PA27 Wilkinson Street – Former PZ Cussons	
Number of Respondents - 4	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
1540 – Environment Agency (EA)	
3529 – Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments:

1. Pedals supports the allocation and its reference to new and improved walking and cycling links.
2. EA supports the fact that Nottingham City Council will investigate future option regarding flood risk.
3. HSE states that the site encroaches on inner, middle and outer zone of a major accident hazard site.
4. NLAF supports the improved cycling and walking links, but considers the opportunity for a bridge over Leen should be included.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support is noted.
2. EA comments noted.
3. Development Principles refer to need for prior consultation.
4. NLAF support noted. This allocation does not preclude the provision of a bridge over the river Leen.

PA28 Ransom Road – Hine Hall	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England (HE)	
3659 – Joseph Kelly	
3679 – Matt Law	

Summary of Comments

1. HE object to the allocation.
2. The development may have negative impact on the wildlife in the areas, and the Development Principles should make provision for the protection, improvement of green and forested areas, which in some cases should be left undeveloped.
3. The joint landowners will not agree on the development of the site which should thus be removed from the allocation list.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The owners have recently confirmed that they do not wish to see this site developed therefore it is no longer proposed to be allocated.

PA29 Bobbers Mill Bridge – Land Adjacent to Bobbers Mill Industrial Estate	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
1540 – Environment Agency (EA)	

Summary of Comments:

1. EA supports the fact that Nottingham City Council will investigate future option regarding flood risk

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support is noted.

PA30 Bobbers Mill Bridge – Bobbers Mill Industrial Estate	
Number of Respondents - 5	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
1540 – Environment Agency (EA)	
3673 – Giovanni Russo	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	
3758 – Mohammed Butt (Legends Gymnasium)	

Summary of Comment

1. Pedals welcome the opportunity for walking and cycling links in the site.
2. EA welcomes the fact that the Nottingham City Council will investigate flood risk further.
3. The access to the site on Chadwin Road will exacerbate the existing traffic issues along the proposed route from Bobbers Mill Bridge and Alfreton Road.
4. NLAF supports opportunity for walking and cycling links.
5. Legends Gymnasium is concerned with the lack of notification of the proposals and about the impact of the proposal.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support noted.
2. Comments noted.
3. The quantum of development proposed can in principle be accommodated on the existing highway network with further assessment at the detailed design stage.
4. Support noted.
5. The site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to a Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and consultation with Sport England and other statutory bodies. Development Principles ensures design, layout, and access are carefully considered through the development management process. Site notices were placed on the development site and occupiers and residents were informed.

PA31 Ascot Road – Speedo	
Number of Respondents - 0	Number of responses - 0
Site Complete – Allocation deleted	

PA32 Beechdale Road – South of Former Co-op Dairy	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
3680 – Eithne Molloy	

Summary of Comment

1. NWT believes development of the site may have a detrimental impact on the nearby Local Wildlife Site. Suggest a Buffer Zone alongside the woodland edge.
2. The proposal in combination with PA33 and PA34 will result in an increase in traffic and congestion and impact on pedestrian safety.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles have been amended to make reference to the Ancient Woodland and the need for sensitive boundary treatment.
2. The site area has been reduced to reflect the fact that two of the existing uses do not wish to move and the new quantum of development proposed can, in principle, be accommodated on the existing highway network.

PA33 Chalfont Drive – Former Government Buildings	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England (HE)	
0431 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
3680 – Eithne Molloy	

Summary of Comments

1. HE suggests reference is made to the Grade II listed status of the building.
2. NWT suggest the need for a detailed ecological survey on the site and to consider mitigation solutions in the form of nest boxes.
3. This proposal in combination with PA32 and PA34 will result in an increase in traffic and congestion as well as impact on pedestrian safety.

Summary of Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

1. Reference to the Grade II Listed Building is made in the Development Principles for the site.
2. Planning permission for the site has already been granted and biodiversity on the site has been fully considered.
3. The quantum of development proposed can, in principle, be accommodated on the existing highway network. Detailed highways issues will be considered through the Development Management process.

PA34 Beechdale Road – Former Beechdale Baths	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
3160 – Intu Properties	
3680 – Eithne Molloy	

Summary of Comments

1. Intu Properties suggests the Development Principles reflect the fact that the proposed food store must be subject to sequential test in accordance to Policy SH4.
2. This proposal in combination with PA32 and PA33 will result in an increase in traffic and congestion as well as impact on pedestrian safety.

Summary of Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

1. The site addresses a specific qualitative deficiency in the western estates. A sequential test is not required if the floorspace proposed does not exceed that set out in Appendix 5.
2. The quantum of development proposed can, in principle, be accommodated on the existing highway network. Detailed highways issues will be considered through the Development Management process.

PA35 Woodyard Lane - Siemens	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. Supports the allocation of the site.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support noted.

PA36 Russell Drive – Radford Bridge Allotments	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
3490 - Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group) (OSCG)	

Summary Comments

1. NWT recommend a further ecological survey to consider the impact of the allocation on the loss of allotment and any negative impact on wildlife and habitat.
2. OSCG states that the site is currently greenfield or partially greenfield, and that it would divert development from brownfield sites. It is suggested to assess the site against its biodiversity value, green network importance and accessibility.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Planning permission for residential development was granted at appeal and the allocation reflects this permission.
2. The site is considered suitable for development and has planning permission. Development Principles ensure public access to open space within the site and to existing open spaces to the north and to the west.

PA37 Robin Hood Chase	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

PA38 Carlton Road – Former Castle College	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 8
List of Consultees who responded	
3720 – Carlton Road Developments	

Summary of Comments

1. What is proposed will result in underutilisation of the site, as the allocation of open space is incompatible with development of sport facilities. More flexibility in term of land use must be awarded, to ensure the financial viability of sporting facilities on the site. The Development Principles do not take into account the discussion between the owner and the Nottinghamshire County Football Club. Proposes an alternative development for the site, including allocating the south-eastern part of the site for retail.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The area to the south east of the site is retained as open space. The Open Space Network designation was reinstated following comments received during the Issues and Options consultation and an Open Space Toolkit Assessment of the enlarged site. The reduced site as included in the Preferred Option and Publication version of the LAPP is considered appropriate for development as set out in the development principles. The site is out of centre and therefore is not considered appropriate for retail use.

PA39 Carlton Road – Former Albany Works Site and Co-op	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
3704 – Co-operative Group	

Summary of Comments

1. Believes the proposed development is not deliverable because it does not consider the current A1 use of the site, the Development Principles refer to a planning application, the proposed mixed use development is unlawful and the proposed family houses are undeliverable. Suggests the Coop site be included in the Centre of Neighbourhood Importance (CONI).

Summary of Nottinghamshire City Council Response

1. The Development Principles reflect the planning permission referred to as it has been granted. Development Principles have been amended to refer to 'including' family housing, instead of 'predominantly'. The allocation includes A1 development. The Centre of Neighbourhood Importance boundary has been amended to incorporate the site. The site boundary has been amended to exclude the area that has recently been developed for retail.

PA40 Daleside Road – Former Colwick Service Station	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access forum	

Summary of Comments

1. Supports this allocation

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support noted

PA41 Alfreton Road – Forest Mill	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England (HE)	
0917 – Cllr Anne Peach	
1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)	

Summary of Comments

1. HE suggest site is removed from the Conservation Area.
2. Nottingham Action Group and Councillor Anne Peach support the allocation of the site, and suggest that development of the site should have regard to the design, scale and layout of the existing housing and the Conservation Area on streets adjacent to the site.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site now has planning permission and it is considered that it continues to have a relationship with the setting of the Conservation Area. The Council does not propose to remove it from the Conservation Area boundary.
2. Support and comments are noted. The Development Principles make provision to provide an attractive and active frontage to Alfreton Road and development to be carefully designed to preserve and enhance the Conservation Area.

PA42 Ilkeston Road – Radford Mill	
Number of Respondents - 4	Number of Responses - 5
List of Consultees who responded	
0917 – Cllr Anne Peach	
1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)	
3712 – Kerrie Robb	
3745 – Gauher Yaqub	

Summary of Comments

1. Cllr Anne Peach supports the Allocation and notes that the Radford Mill building is a landmark that must be saved.
2. NAG supports the retention of the Radford Mill and suggest consideration of a number of alternative uses.
3. Businesses that are relocated should receive support and assistance. One business currently renting part of the site oppose the allocation as it will affect the livelihood of his/her shop and other businesses active on the site.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Planning permission has been granted for the conversion of the Mill and new build flats.

PA43 Salisbury Street	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0917 – Cllr Anne Peach	
1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)	
3529 – Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	

Summary of Comments

1. Cllr Anne Peach notes that the design of the site must be considered to avoid overlooking on nearby estates. NAG believes the development of the site must consider adjacent family houses in term of scale, design and massing.
2. HSE states that the site encroaches on the middle and outer zone of a major accident hazard site.

Summary of Nottingham City Council

1. The site has planning permission. The Development Principles require that design, layout and access should be carefully considered to avoid adverse impacts.
2. The Development Principles refer to the need for prior consultation.

PA44 Derby Road – Sandfield Centre	
Number of Respondents - 5	Number of Responses - 8
List of Consultees who responded	
0917 – Cllr Anne Peach	
1402 – Nottingham Action Group	
2702 – Mr & Mrs Randle (Late response)	
3669 – Muhammad Zulfiqar	
3670 – Sandfield Day Nursery	

Summary of Comments

1. Councillor Anne Peach suggests that considering the high density of Houses in Multiple Occupation in the area the site should be allocated for family houses. Also suggests the continuation of the green corridor through the site be included.
2. Nottingham Action Group suggests site be retained for education use, and if not possible, allocate it for high quality family houses. Suggests the continuation of the green corridor through the site be included.
3. Two residents are concerned about 3-storey building facing Ashburn Avenue.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles have been amended to propose predominantly family housing. They also refer to the improvement of walking and cycling links which could be via a green corridor.
2. The site is surplus to education requirements and is being marketed for residential development. The Development Principles have been amended to focus development on family housing and make provision for cycling and walking links. Provision for green corridor will be considered through the development management process.
3. The site is being allocated for predominantly family housing and the Development Principles state that careful consideration should be given to the impact on surrounding development. Detailed amenity issues will be considered through the Development Management process.

PA45 Prospect Place	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)	

Summary of Comments

1. NAG supports the development principle, particularly the new green space and landscape areas. Suggests the site should encourage innovative design, be reserved for family housing, and include the future redevelopment of existing business on the land to the south.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support noted. Land to the south was not included in this allocation as it is currently in use but it could come forward through the Development Management process.

PA46 Derby Road – Former Hillside Club	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded	
1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)	
2702 - Mr & Mrs Randle - (Late response)	

Summary of Comments

1. NAG supports the Allocation, suggests it should be reserved for innovative, high quality design family housing with potentially some degree of self-build. It could include a hotel facility for the adjacent hospital. Suggests the site boundary be extended to include the Bell Fruit Company car park.
2. Two residents support the Allocation.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support noted. Self-build opportunities are not precluded on this site.
2. Support noted.

PA47 Abbey Street/Leengate	
Number of Respondents - 5	Number of Responses - 7
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 - Pedals	
1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)	
2702 – Mr & Mrs Randle	
3665 – Saint-Gobain	
3703 – Bell Fruit Games	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the allocation and highlight importance of cycling.
2. NAG suggests the site be allocated for employment only and regrets the unfeasibility of a Medi-park proposal. Supports the enhancement of the River Leen and creation of a green corridor.
3. Saint-Gobain and Bell Fruit Games are concerned that the site will lose its importance as an employment site if it is re- developed in part or full for the benefit of the Queen Medical Centre.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support noted.
2. The site is allocated for employment uses, facilities which support the QMC and a hotel and potentially an element of residential in order to been the needs of the area. Support noted.
3. The site lies within the Nottingham Enterprise Zone and as such is safeguarded as a key development/ regeneration site. The Development Principles clarify that employment is the primary use. The importance of existing businesses is recognised in the Development Principles.

PA48 Queens Drive – Land adjacent to the Portal	
Number of Respondents - 0	Number of responses - 0
Site Complete – Allocation deleted	

PA49 NG2 West – Enterprise Way	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
3725 – Miller Birch Partnership	

Summary of Comments

1. Miller Birch Partnership suggests the boundary be amended to include the undeveloped plot south of Enterprise Way. Suggests uses A3-A5 for the site to reflect the use considered acceptable as per Policy EE2. Believes the Development Principles are overly prescriptive.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site boundary has been amended to reflect the comment. It is considered EE2 already makes provision for ancillary development. The Development Principles are not considered overly prescriptive.

PA50 NG2 South – Queens Drive	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	

PA51 Riverside Way	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. NLAF comment that links to the 'Big Track' should be included.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Owners of much of the site have confirmed that they do not wish to relocate. The remaining part falls below the 0.5 hectares threshold. Site has been removed from the Local Plan.

PA52 University Boulevard – Nottingham Science and Technology Park	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded – N/A	

PA53 Electric Avenue	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England (HE)	

Summary of Comments

1. HE advises that development principles should refer to need to take account of the setting of grade II listed Church of St Wilfrid.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. No change proposed as development principles set out that proposals should have regard to heritage assets located on the east bank of the River Trent.

PA54 Boots	
Number of Respondents - 6	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded	
0188 – J Potter	
0225 – Pedals	
0259 – Broxtowe Borough Council	
0311 – Historic England	
3529 – Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	
3530 – Highways England	

Summary of Comments

1. The proposals should be sympathetic/sensitive to the river scenery.
2. 'Pedals' comment that the importance for cycling noted.
3. Broxtowe Borough Council comment that the proposals for Boots site are consistent with those in the Broxtowe part of the site.
4. Historic England states that the layout of the 'campus' should be more specifically described as a 'grid'. A development brief, informed by conservation would be beneficial.
5. The Health and Safety Executive state that the site encroaches on the inner, middle and outer zone of one major accident hazard pipeline, the inner and outer zones of another major accident hazard pipeline and the outer zone of a major accident hazard site.
6. Highways England comment that the proposed allocation has the potential to impact on the operation of the strategic road network. Welcome reference in the development principles to the need for a Transport Assessment.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site has been subject to a masterplan and now has planning permission. Both Policy RE6 and the Development Principles for the site refer to retaining or creating a buffer adjacent to the canal, which is between the site and the river.
2. Comments noted.
3. Comments noted.
4. Comments noted. Description not considered fundamental to soundness of plan. Planning permission for mixed use development has been granted therefore not appropriate to produce a development brief.

5. Comments noted, however, the site has planning permission. The Development Principles do state that within Hazardous Installation Consultation Zone - prior notification required but not considered a barrier to development.
6. Comments noted.

PA55 Ruddington Lane – Rear of 107 - 127	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3702 – Deancoast Ltd	

Summary of Comments

1. The text should be amended to acknowledge the location of the site immediately adjacent to the tram stop. The site could provide a mix of dwelling types including apartments as well as family homes extended to include additional land.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles have been amended to reference the Tram stop. Predominantly family housing is considered appropriate for this location but does not preclude an element of other housing types. Whilst an extended area is shown as a potential extension in the SHLAA the current boundary has been assessed and subjected to consultation.

PA56 Sturgeon Avenue – The Spinney	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group) (OSCG)	
3701 – Cllr Andrew Rule	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT considers the mature trees on site provide important habitat links to the pond / LWS and wish to see any redevelopment restricted to the previously developed part of the site.
2. This site forms part of a number of sites that are greenfield or partially greenfield and it contributes its own value to the City's Open Space Network. It is considered that there are sufficient brownfield or underused sites that could satisfy housing requirements. Before any greenfield site is allocated the site should be assessed against its value for biodiversity, importance as part of the green network and accessibility from where people live based on the "Breathing Space" standards.
3. The development must provide sufficient car-parking.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. This is a brownfield site partly cleared adjacent to care home. Previous permission for residential development. Through development there may be opportunities to improve Green Infrastructure. The Development Principles state that proposals should not adversely affect the Local Wildlife Site adjacent to the site.
2. The allocation of this site, alongside many brownfield sites, is required to help to meet the Council's objectively assessed housing need. The site is considered suitable for development and has been subject to a Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and consultation with statutory bodies. Through development there may be opportunities to improve Green Infrastructure. The Development Principles state that proposals should not adversely affect the Local Wildlife Site adjacent to the site.
3. Development management policies would ensure that the development provides sufficient car-parking.

PA57 Clifton West	
Number of Respondents - 17	Number of Responses - 51
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0188 - J Potter 0225 – Pedals 0311 – Historic England 0838 – Sport England 1883 – Mr & Mrs Buckley 2448 – Carol Mee 2455 – Nathan Giles 2501 – Paul Clayton 2532 – Nichola Judd and David Rodgers 3490 – Tom Huggon (Open Spaces Champions Group) 3678 – Clive Thomas 3698 – Robert Thatcher 3707 – Trevor Hurst 3731 – Nottingham Trent University (Planning & Design) (NTU) 3733 – Charles Hunt 3734 – Shaz Brooks 3736 – Natasha and Neil Williams</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. 'Pedals' note the importance for cycling.
2. HE concerned about harm resulting from this allocation. Disagree with findings of the Sustainability Appraisal, which accords only moderate negative impacts. Position of grade I listed Clifton Hall is core to its significance. Development of the site could harm the setting. Individual comments also referred to the impact on heritage.
3. Sport England confirms that the loss of the site has been fully considered as part of the Nottingham City Playing Pitch Strategy 2015. Sport England therefore raises no objection to the disposal of the site.
4. NTU consider this a deliverable site that can be bought forward early in the Plan period, and, that the edge of Green Belt location, the Landscape Character Area and good access to transport will create a desirable place to live.
5. 3 respondents objected that the proposal would harm/result in a loss to future generations of environment/wildlife as well as cause loss of trees, including protected woodland/preserved trees.
6. 8 respondents objected about access to the site off Hawksley Gardens, Finchley Close and Falconwood Road.
7. 3 respondents objected that there are insufficient facilities to accommodate further residents.

8. 5 respondents objected that the proposal would harm a public bridleway of heritage value. 5 respondents objected that the proposal would impact on the Green Belt and recreation.
9. There were individual comments that the proposal is unsound/unjustified due to the topography and worthy views, it would disrupt land used by walkers and families for recreation. The proposed buildings are too close to property. The proposal devalues property. It would result in noise/pollution during construction. A section from the front of a property would be removed to enable road widening. The land should remain as agriculture.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. 'Pedals' comments noted.
2. The allocation of this site (alongside the many brownfield sites) is required to help to meet the Council's objectively assessed housing need. The site is considered suitable for residential development and has been subject to a Site Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and consultation with Sport England and other statutory bodies. The site is allocated in the Adopted Local Plan for housing. Development principles require that development should be sensitive to the neighbouring historic environment and setting of heritage assets. The principles require sensitive design to minimise impacts.
3. Comments noted.
4. Comments noted.
5. The requirements of the Development Principles will address many of the issues through sensitive layout, design, incorporation of habitat buffers and provision of publicly accessible open space.
6. The quantum of development proposed can in principle be accommodated on the existing highway network with further assessment at the detailed design stage. Access will be addressed through the masterplanning and Development Management process.
7. The plan is subject to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, prepared in consultation with service providers, which considers the infrastructure requirements associated with the spatial objectives and growth anticipated by the LAPP. It is considered that the quantum of development proposed can be accommodated without serious detriment to existing infrastructure and services but with further detailed assessment and confirmation of any mitigation measures to take place at planning application stage.
8. The Bridleway will be considered through the masterplanning and Development Management process.
9. The quantum of development proposed can in principle be accommodated on the existing highway network with further assessment at the detailed design stage. Development Principles require that design, layout and access should be carefully considered to avoid adverse impacts on existing residential properties. Access via the south of the site would not be viable.
10. The relationship of future development with surrounding properties would be assessed through the Development Management process when detailed development proposals come forward. The valuation of land/property is not a material planning consideration. The requirements of the Development Principles will help address many of the issues raised in the SA through sensitive layout, design, incorporation of habitat buffers and provision of publicly accessible open space. The site is directly adjacent to existing

residential development, is not at flood risk or within the Green Belt and has few physical constraints following completion of the A453. Site has potential to make a significant contribution to housing growth. Site is therefore suitable for allocation for residential development. The requirements of the Development Principles make provision for provision of publicly accessible open space.

PA58 Green Lane – Fairham House	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
0188 – J Potter	
2532 - Nichola Judd and David Rodgers	

Summary of Comments

1. The proposal is unsound/unjustified as the uses should just be residential.
2. The number of houses could be increased over retail given the amount of empty commercial buildings

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles states that retail proposals will only be acceptable where they can demonstrably support the role of Clifton District Centre.
2. Given the site's close proximity to Clifton District Centre, it has potential to accommodate a variety of complementary uses which can help support Clifton District Centre. The document sets out the quantum of residential development at 24 units to reflect the planning permission.

PA59 Farnborough Road – Former Fairham Comprehensive School	
Number of Respondents - 10	Number of Responses - 19
List of Consultees who responded	
0169 – Malcolm Varley	
0188 - J Potter	
0225 – Pedals	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
2532 – Nichola Judd and David Rodgers 3664 – 4061 4924	
3672 – Colleen Jacklin	
3674 – John Bridgewater	
3718 – Agnieszka Komoterska	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. 'Pedals' noted the importance for cycling.
2. NWT supports provision of improved publicly accessible greenspace and biodiversity and a green corridor. NWT wishes to see green space/ corridors of habitat creation in around the pylons at the eastern boundary of the site. The Development Principles should make it clear that new Green Infrastructure corridors should provide strong links with the adjacent Clifton Pastures development site in Rushcliffe.
3. 5 respondents raised concerns about development on the site as it is Green Belt, nature reserve, flood plain and an area used as open space.
4. 2 respondents raised concerns about increase traffic as a result of the development.
5. 2 respondents raised concerns about the impact of development on existing infrastructure and services including shops, the police, doctors surgeries and local schools.
6. An individual stated that the former Fairham Comprehensive School itself would benefit from re-development.
7. NLAFF support the exploration of improved links between site, Clifton and Clifton Pastures.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Comments noted.

2. The Development Principles require development to address open space provision on site and landscape character. The form of the development should help form the establishment of a defensible Green Belt boundary. As part of the assessment of the suitability of the site, the City Council's 'Open Space toolkit' has been applied, and accordingly the development principles include the retention and creation of open space e.g. Fairham link to the Fairham Brook nature reserve.
3. It is considered that there are exceptional circumstances for the removal of this site from the Green Belt. Site could make a significant contribution to housing delivery. It is linear in form and wraps around the edge of the existing urban area off Summerwood Lane. An urban extension is proposed to the south of the site within Rushcliffe and this site provides an opportunity to provide local highway, walking and cycling connections to better integrate the existing Clifton community and new development. The form and shape closely follows the urban area and subject to sensitive design, layout and landscaping (particularly at the boundaries of the site) to filter and soften views and to reinforce the Green Belt boundary allocation for residential use is considered appropriate. Proposed site area reduced to avoid flood risk. The proposed site area has been reduced to avoid areas of known flood risk. A Playing Pitch Strategy considered the loss of this site and concluded that the site can be allocated for residential development with a proportion retained as open space.
4. The quantum of development proposed can in principle be accommodated on the existing highway network with further assessment at the detailed design stage.
5. The plan is subject to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, prepared in consultation with service providers, which considers the infrastructure requirements associated with the spatial objectives and growth anticipated by the LAPP. It is considered that the quantum of development proposed can be accommodated without serious detriment to existing infrastructure and services but with further detailed assessment and confirmation of any mitigation measures to take place at planning application stage. Former school site now vacant, surplus and subject to vandalism
6. The focus for new development will be the regeneration of the existing brownfield element of the site.
7. Support noted.

PA60 Victoria Centre	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
3160 – Intu Properties	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT considers there is the potential for further/ additional garden roofs, green and brown roofs, green walls, wildlife boxes etc.
2. Intu Properties considers the Development Principles text should be amended to emphasise the importance of pedestrian linkages between Intu Victoria Centre and Intu Broadmarsh given the importance of the two shopping centres to the viability and vitality of the City Centre.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Development Principles reflect the planning permission granted for extension and redevelopment of Victoria Centre.
2. The importance of north south linkages is acknowledged, and covered in Core Strategy Policy 5.

PA61 Royal Quarter – Burton Street, Guildhall, Police Station and Fire Station	
Number of Respondents - 4	Number of Responses - 9
List of Consultees who responded	
1381 – E.ON	
3160 – Intu Properties	
3731 – Nottingham Trent University (Planning & Design) (NTU)	
3739 – Land Securities PLC (LS)	

Summary of Comments

1. E.ON broadly supports the allocation. But does not consider effective guidance and specifically the absence of guidance regarding the amenity of the adjoining buildings is provided. Without specific parameters being explained clearly considers the site allocation to not be effective and may unnecessarily constrain or delay development. Amended wording suggested.
2. Intu support retail as auxiliary use, but comment that leisure uses should be restricted to serve local needs only.
3. NTU Support inclusion of site and proposed uses. An appropriate mix to facilitate progression of the area.
4. LS concerned about hotel or residential use and its impact on the operations of the Cornerhouse, due to noise impact on new development. Residential development should only be allowed on the northern part of the site. Consideration should also be given to A1 retail use on the site. If leisure uses allocated, then there should be a restriction to any cinema development on the site. A3 and A4 uses are likely to conflict with proposed residential uses, and lead to over saturation and cumulative impact. Concerned about the deliverability of housing, since Fire Station still operating from the site.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Amenity of occupiers of adjoining properties will be considered at planning permission stage. These issues are already adequately addressed by Policies CC1 and DE1.
2. This is a City Centre site where a mix of uses including hotel, leisure and residential uses as part of a mixed use development would be appropriate.
3. Support noted.
4. Any potential noise impacts on new development, should they arise, would be considered under Policy IN2. This is a City Centre site where a mix of uses including hotel, leisure and residential uses as part of a mixed use development would be appropriate. The fire station has now been successfully re-located to London Road, and the site has been marketed for development with ongoing discussions between

Nottingham City and NTU as landowners and potential developments. It is considered that the site is deliverable within the plan period.

PA62 Creative Quarter – Brook Street East	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	

Summary of Comments

1. NWT concerned about being neighbours to the site. They have numerous access points to the rear of their buildings, off Bedford Row and require continued vehicle and pedestrian access to these points during and post any development of site. Highlight the sensitivity of their office which is a Grade II listed building and raise concerns about impact on the setting of the building and through construction. Considers that sufficient parking should be provided on site due to existing parking issues in the area.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Access will be determined through the detailed planning application stage.
2. This is a highly accessible cleared brownfield site in City Centre, which is suitable for a mix of uses.
3. The Development Principles set out that development should be carefully designed to preserve and enhance the Sneinton Market Conservation Area (which covers part of the site) and Listed Buildings nearby.
4. A flexible approach to providing parking will be achieved by assessing the parking requirements of the development against parking guidance.

PA63 Creative Quarter – Brook Street West	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3714 – Stuart Walker	

Summary of Comments

1. Does not support the plan for this site as it may involve the creation of yet more student homes in an area that is currently inundated with such dwellings. Also believe the suggested development to be potentially disruptive to the many existing residents.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The Postal Sorting Office have confirmed (Jan 2017) that there are no plans to relocate. The site has been deleted from the LAPP.

PA64 Creative Quarter – Sneinton Market	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England	

Summary of Comments

1. Consider the development principles should require retention of the early C20 Sneinton Market buildings. Their loss would be unthinkable. Certainty about their retention would address issues.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Not considered necessary to require retention of buildings, which may unduly constrain development. Development principles for the site require that proposals should be sensitively designed to preserve and enhance heritage assets. Development Principles amended to clarify that development should focus on building fronting onto Lower Parliament Street and Bath Street, to compliment the improvements already undertaken to the rest of the site.

PA65 Creative Quarter – Bus Depot	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England (HE)	
3671 – David Anderson	

Summary of Comments

1. HE consider Frontages between Stanhope Street and Manvers Street should be retained. Wording on development principles should be amended accordingly.
2. Site could be turned into Nottingham Central Bus Station.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Agree. Development Principles amended.
2. The location is not considered central enough to the City Centre to accommodate Nottingham Central Bus Station.

PA66 Castle Quarter, Maid Marian Way – College Site	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 - Pedals	
0311 – Historic England (HE)	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. 'Pedals' noted the importance for cycling.
2. HE agree that redevelopment could better reveal the significance of Nottingham Castle.
3. NLAF comment that there are opportunities to improve north/south and east/west pedestrian and cycle connections between Canal Quarter, City Centre and Lace Market.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. 'Pedals' comments noted.
2. HE comments noted. Wording of Development Principles changed to refer to opportunities to enhance buildings on Isabella Street. Not considered appropriate to include presumption of their retention.
3. These opportunities are referred to in the Development Principles.

PA67 Broadmarsh Centre	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 6
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England (HE)	
0431 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	
3160 – Intu Properties	

Summary of Comments

1. HE consider the rationale for the boundaries of this site is unclear. Mention of the Canal Conservation area should be made in the development principles.
2. NWT considers that there is the potential for further/additional roofs, green and brown roofs, green walls, wildlife boxes
3. Intu Properties supports the allocation. Considers that Office (B1) use and education (D1) use should be identified as auxiliary as part of a mixed use scheme. The allocation should be divided into three distinct site allocations (parts A, B and C), as per the Preferred Options consultation document, reflecting the intu Broadmarsh planning permission, whilst the other areas within the wider site allocation require redevelopment. It would also reflect the varying ownership boundaries within the site allocation and realistic site boundaries of redevelopment schemes. An identified 'development principle' is "improving north/south and east/west pedestrian linkages and high quality connections to the Canal, Creative and Castle Quarters and retail core with opportunities for new external routes." Intu support the improvement of north/south connections between intu Broadmarsh and the Primary Shopping Area, albeit given the importance of intu Victoria Centre in the Primary Shopping Area it is considered that this should also be explicitly referenced in the text.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site boundaries reflect current development proposals.
2. The Development Principles reflects the planning permission granted for extension and redevelopment of Broadmarsh Centre.
3. Support is noted. Site included as one allocation due to the strong interrelationships between the various parts of the site. The links referred to in the Development Principles are either within the site or within the immediate vicinity. The issue of north south links is a strategic matter, and is referred to in Core Strategy Policy 5.

PA68 Canal Quarter – Island Site	
Number of Respondents - 5	Number of Responses - 5
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 - Pedals	
0311 – Historic England (HE)	
3160 – Intu Properties	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	
3761 – Kate Bowley	

Summary of Comments

1. 'Pedals' note the importance for cycling.
2. HE consider the reference to 'having regard' to heritage assets is too vague and unspecific. The grade II listed building on site has statutory protection and could be converted to the benefit of the site, anchoring further development.
3. Intu Properties state that the site is located within the City Centre boundary but outside the designated Primary Shopping Area. Consider the wording of the site allocation inconsistent. Significant retail development on this site could undermine planned investment within the Primary Shopping Area in the City Centre. The wording of the 'Proposed Use' needs amending to ensure that any retail use is ancillary and small scale to serve local convenience needs.
4. NLAG welcome recognition that development should consider relationship with canal towpath. Should exploit opportunities to links the site, other development sites and the canal towpath. Bankside habitats should be retained and an accessible riverside green corridor created.
5. Supports the document as the development of this site has been long awaited. Would support a supermarket and a play area being developed on this site.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. 'Pedals' comment noted.
2. An Island Site SPD has now been adopted which covers Heritage issues for the site.
3. The SPD includes this level of retail. However, it is envisaged that this will be provided throughout the development, to serve local needs, rather than being provided in the form of large retail units. The Development Principles have been amended to reflect this.
4. Greater detail on the required nature of development proposals are set out in the SPD for this site. Development principles set out that links to the surrounding area and the

canal towpath should be provided. Policy EN5 sets out requirements for the protection, maintenance and enhancement of bankside habitats.

5. The Development Principles state that an element of supporting retail use may be acceptable subject to scale and impact on the vitality/vibrancy of the City Centre, and, state that new open space should be provided. Type and quantity of open space required will depend on nature of uses proposed.

PA69 Canal Quarter – Station Street/Carrington Street	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England	
3160 – Intu Properties	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. HE consider the revised wording of development principles should go further, applying same requirement for 11-19 Station Street as for 3-9 and 21c Station St. to ensure retention of frontages contributing to the Conservation area.
2. Intu Properties comment that auxiliary retail is supported. However, leisure uses should only serve local needs.
3. NLAF would welcome recognition that development should consider relationship with canal towpath. Bankside habitats should be retained and an accessible riverside green corridor created.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. HE comments noted. A development brief has been prepared for the site 11-19 Station Street. It is therefore not considered necessary to amend the proposed wording of the Development Principles.
2. Partially agree. Leisure development should be subject to sequential test and impact assessment (if of sufficient scale). A reference to this covering all PA sites has been made to the text on page 171 "Site Allocations" to make this clear.
3. Development Principles set out that redevelopment should carefully consider the relationship between the site and the canal towpath, and exploit opportunities to create access and links between them and the canal frontage. Policy EN5 sets out requirements for the protection, maintenance and enhancement of bankside habitats.

PA70 Canal Quarter – Queens Road, East of Nottingham Station	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 8
List of Consultees who responded	
3160 – Intu Properties	
3223 – Thames Water Pension	

Summary of Comments

1. Intu Properties consider the Development Principles should be amended to state that leisure development should be small scale and should only serve the needs generated by the scheme, unless the impact test is satisfied.
2. Thames Water Pension welcome the allocation but consider the policy approach to the site is unnecessarily prescriptive, imposes unjustified constraints and renders development and regeneration unviable. The allocation is ineffective and unsound. Flood risk should be amended to refer to medium not high flood risk. Allocation includes reference to Minerals Safeguarding Area, Air Quality Area and Archaeological Constraints Area which are unsubstantiated and not raised during determination of the planning application for the site. Object to exclusion of larger format retail use which is unjustified. Inclusion of a requirement for building design to 'positively address' a prominent corner is unnecessary and over prescriptive and not based on an assessment of the sites constraints and viability and is therefore not justified and inconsistent with NPPF.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Partially agree with Intu Properties. Leisure development should be subject to sequential test and impact assessment (if of sufficient scale). A reference to this covering all PA sites will be made to the text on page 171 "Site Allocations" to make this clear.
2. Development Principles for all sites set out key design and heritage considerations and factual designations to be considered in scheme development and are entirely appropriate for a Local Plan. NPPF (para 137) states that LPAs should look for opportunities for new development in Conservation Areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that other uses are unviable. Flood risk information has been agreed with the EA based on 'without defences' scenario however in light of technical information in planning application flood risk has been amended to 'medium'. In determining planning applications the NPPF expects LPAs to take account of the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (Para 131). No evidence submitted to demonstrate site has been marketed for alternative uses or that such uses are unviable other than marketing

information for a different scheme. Surrounding developments include mixed use. Plan wide viability assessment indicate the council's approach is sound. Development principles to do not preclude retail at ground floor provided this is part of a sensitively designed scheme of an appropriate scale, height and density to respond to heritage issues and regeneration objectives. NPPF supports development which protects and enhances the setting of heritage assets with appropriately designed development therefore the requirement is entirely justified.

PA71 Canal Quarter – Sheriffs Way, Sovereign House	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

PA72 Canal Quarter – Waterway Street	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

PA73 Canal Quarter – Sheriffs Way/Arkwright Street	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

PA74 Canal Quarter – Arkwright Street	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
0311 – Historic England	
3694 – Phil Ambrose	

Summary of Comments

1. HE considers the development principles should specify the retention of the former Queens Hotel.
2. Development may be too close or too high to the Picture Works apartment as this would impact on privacy.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. It is not considered appropriate to include requirement for retention of specific buildings within the Conservation Area. All policies should be read in conjunction with the Local Plan Part 1, and Heritage issues are addressed elsewhere in the plan.
2. The Development Principles state that development should have regard to nearby housing.

PA75 Canal Quarter – Crocus Street, Southpoint	
Number of Respondents - 0	
List of Consultees who responded	
N/A	

PA76 Waterside – London road, Former Hartwells	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
3160 – Intu Properties	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the reference to cycling.
2. Intu Properties suggests the Development Principles be amended to allow for small scale leisure development that only serves the needs generated by the development, unless the impact test is satisfied.
3. NLAF welcomes the reference to the canal towpath and suggests potential additional links and the retention of a green corridor on the bankside be explored.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Pedals' support is noted.
2. A footnote to Policy SH4 and a new paragraph 6.16c has been added to clarify that PA sites are subject to sequential and impact test.
3. Development Principles refer to the opportunities presented by the canal frontage, while Policies EN5 and RE8 support protection of the bankside and provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages.

PA77 Waterside – London Road, Eastcroft Depot	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
3160 – Intu Properties	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the reference to cycling.
2. Intu Properties suggests the Development Principles be amended to allow for small scale leisure development that only serves the needs generated by the development, unless the impact test is satisfied.
3. Nottingham Local Access Forum welcomes the reference to the canal towpath and suggests to explore potential additional links and retention of a green corridor on the bankside.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Pedals' support is noted.
2. A footnote to Policy SH4 and a new paragraph 6.16c has been added to clarify that PA sites are subject to sequential and impact test.
3. Development Principles refer to the opportunities presented by the canal frontage, while Policies EN5 and RE8 support protection of the bankside and provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages.

PA78 Waterside – London Road, South of Eastcroft Depot	
Number of Respondents - 3	Number of Responses - 3
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
3160 – Intu Properties	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the reference to cycling.
2. Intu Properties suggests the Development Principles be amended to allow for small scale leisure development that only serves the needs generated by the development, unless the impact test is satisfied.
3. Nottingham Local Access Forum welcomes the reference to the canal towpath and suggests to explore potential additional links and retention of a green corridor on the bankside.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Pedals' support is noted.
2. A footnote to Policy SH4 and a new paragraph 6.16c has been added to clarify that PA sites are subject to sequential and impact test.
3. Development Principles refer to the opportunities presented by the canal frontage, while Policies EN5 and RE8 support protection of the bankside and provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages.

PA79 Waterside – Iremonger Road	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the reference to cycling.
2. NLAF welcomes the reference to the canal towpath and suggests to explore potential additional links and retention of a green corridor on the bankside.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support is noted.
2. Development Principles refer to the opportunities presented by the canal frontage, while Policies EN5 and RE8 support protection of the bankside and provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages.

PA80 Waterside – Cattle Market	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
3160 - Intu Properties	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the reference to cycling.
2. Intu Properties suggests the Development Principles be amended to allow for small scale leisure development that only serves the needs generated by the development, unless the impact test is satisfied.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Pedals' support is noted.
2. A footnote to Policy SH4 and a new paragraph 6.16c has been added to clarify that PA sites are subject to sequential and impact test.

PA81 Waterside – Meadow Lane	
Number of Respondents - 5	Number of Responses - 7
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
3160 – Intu Properties	
3691 – Muller UK	
3723 – Placedynamix	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the reference to cycling.
2. Intu Properties suggests the Development Principles be amended to allow for small scale leisure development that only serves the needs generated by the development, unless the impact test is satisfied.
3. Muller UK suggests reference is made in the Development Principles to the wider policies in the plan that refer to the need for comprehensive development. It also suggests provision is made to avoid piecemeal development.
4. Placedynamix supports the allocation of the site.
5. Nottingham Local Access Forum welcomes the reference to the canal towpath and suggests exploring potential additional links and retention of a green corridor on the bankside.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Support noted.
2. A footnote to Policy SH4 and a new paragraph 6.16c has been added to clarify that PA sites are subject to sequential and impact test.
3. Policy RE1 and RE8 ensure that piecemeal redevelopment would not undermine opportunity for redevelopment. As policies will not be applied in isolation there is no need to make reference to them in the Development Principles.
4. Placedynamix's support is noted.
5. Development Principles refer to the opportunities presented by the canal frontage, while Policies EN5 and RE8 support protection of the bankside and provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages.

PA82 Waterside – Freeth Street	
Number of Respondents - 4	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
3653 – Veolia	
3737 – Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC)	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the reference to cycling.
2. Veolia suggests the text be amended to reflect the significance of the waste management facility. NCC expresses concern that the allocation is in conflict with Policy CWS10 and the adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (adopted December 2013).
3. NLAF welcomes the reference to the canal towpath and suggests potential additional links and retention of a green corridor on the bankside be explored.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Pedals' support is noted.
2. The regeneration of the Waterside Area is a long held ambition of the Council, and both site PA82 and PA83, including the site occupied by Veolia, are important allocations to realise such an ambition and they are embedded in the Aligned Core Strategy. To have regard of established businesses, additional text has been added to criterion a) of the Policy RE8, to paragraph 3.189a and 3.189b of the Justification Text of the same Policy, and to the Development Principles of PA82 and PA83. Policy WCS10 requires the need for safeguarding waste management facilities to be clearly demonstrated.
3. Development Principles refer to the opportunities presented by the canal frontage, while Policies EN5 and RE8 support protection of the bankside including nature conservation and provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages.

PA83 Waterside – Daleside Road, Trent Lane Basin	
Number of Respondents - 4	Number of Responses - 4
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 – Pedals	
3653 – Veolia	
3737 – Nottinghamshire County Council	
3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the reference to cycling.
2. Veolia suggests the text be amended to reflect the significance of the waste management facility. NCC expresses concern that the allocation is in conflict with Policy CWS10 and the adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (adopted December 2013).
3. NLAf welcomes the reference to the canal towpath and suggests potential additional links and retention of a green corridor on the bankside be explored.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Pedals' support is noted.
2. The regeneration of the Waterside Area is a long held ambition of the Council, and both site PA82 and PA83, including the site occupied by Veolia, are important allocations to realise such an ambition and they are embedded in the Aligned Core Strategy. To have regard of established businesses, additional text has been added to criterion a) of the Policy RE8, to paragraph 3.189a and 3.189b of the Justification Text of the same Policy, and to the Development Principles of PA82 and PA83. Policy WCS10 requires the need for safeguarding waste management facilities to be clearly demonstrated.
3. Development Principles refer to the opportunities presented by the canal frontage, while Policies EN5 and RE8 support protection of the bankside including nature conservation and provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages.

PA84 Waterside – Daleside Road, Eastpoint	
Number of Respondents - 1	Number of Responses - 1
List of Consultees who responded	
3160 – Intu Properties	

1. Intu Properties suggests Development Principles be amended to allow for small scale retail development that only serves the needs generated by the development, unless the impact test is satisfied.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. The site has planning permission and is now trading. PA84 has been removed from the Plan.

PA85 Waterside – Trent Lane, Park Yacht Club	
Number of Respondents - 2	Number of Responses - 2
List of Consultees who responded	
0225 - Pedals	
3743 – Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)	

Summary of Comments

1. Pedals supports the reference to cycling
2. NLAF welcomes the reference to the canal towpath and suggests that potential additional links and the retention of a green corridor on the bankside be explored.

Summary of Nottingham City Council Response

1. Pedals' support is noted.
2. Development Principles refer to the opportunities presented by the canal frontage, while Policies EN5 and RE8 support protection of the bankside and provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages.

PA86 Thane Road – Horizon Factory	
Number of Respondents - 13	Number of Responses - 30
List of Consultees who responded	
<p>0188 – Mr J Potter 0311 – Historic England 0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust 0802 – Natural England 1540 – Environment Agency 1685 – Severn Trent 2410 – Environment Health 2452 – Gedling Borough Council 3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council 3530 – Highways England 3644 – National Grid 3786 – Imperial Tobacco and Henry Boot 3787 – Boots UK</p>	

Summary of Comments

1. The site relates visually to parts of Clifton. Particular focus should be given to the design to respect the views of the riverscape and to soften the area towards the green belt fringe. Also comments on the existing building and its demolition.
2. An alternative of residential use be proposed on the South-Western segment.
3. Historic England raises no concern on the allocation.
4. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust suggests a Preliminary Ecological Assessment be undertaken. Expects that drainage will be included as part of the development.
5. Natural England supports the allocation.
6. The Environment Agency states that the site is in a flood risk zone and thus a sequential test and the provision for Sustainable Urban Drainage solutions are required.
7. Severn Trent does not envisage sewer capacity constraints.
8. Environment Health highlights the need for gas monitoring and the design appropriate gas mitigation measures. Mitigation measures will be required to tackle soil contamination.
9. Gedling Borough Council supports the allocation and recommend the protection of employment sites.
10. Highways England consider that development will have a negative impact on the A52 Queen Drive junction.
11. Nottinghamshire County Council and Boots UK consider the allocation will generate similar traffic amount to the previous development.
12. Nottinghamshire County Council suggests the canal to the west is a designated Site of Nature Conservation Interest and that the buffer of vegetation should be retained.
13. Nottinghamshire County Council suggests that the design and layout of the site should minimise any impact on views.
14. National Grid has no comment on the allocation.

15. Imperial Tobacco and Henry Boot object to the restrictive uses proposed for the site and the designation of open space within the site.
16. Boots UK suggests low density offices in the west part of the site would protect Listed Building in the site

Summary of Nottingham City Council

1. The relationship of the site with the surrounding area has been taken into account. Details on landscaping and design will be managed through the development management process. The Development Principles make reference to the long views. Comment on demolition is noted.
2. The site falls within a designated Employment area within the adopted Nottingham Local Plan (2005). A continued employment use here is considered to be appropriate.
3. Historic England comment is noted.
4. In response to NWT Trust, water quality is protected as per Core Strategy Policy CC3. Drainage and ecological assessment will be managed through the development management process.
5. Support to the Policy is noted.
6. Development principles require a site specific flood risk assessment. A sequential test has been performed, as identified in the addendum to the Site Assessments background paper.
7. Severn Trent comment is noted.
8. These issues are identified in the Development Principles and will be managed through the development management process.
9. Gedling Borough Council support is noted.
10. The Site Assessment Background paper addendum has been amended to make reference to the A52, and that proposed developments should be subject to Transport Assessment.
11. Comments noted.
12. The Development Principles have been amended to seek to retain and enhance the wildlife corridor.
13. Protection of view is an element identified in the Development Principles and will be managed through the development management process.
14. Noted.
15. Policy EE2 allows a sufficient wide range of employment uses for the site, and more flexibility is considered inappropriate to meet the Council spatial objective. No additional open space has been allocated within the site. Development Principles seek to secure sensitive boundary treatment to allow for the enhancement of the adjacent wildlife corridors.
16. Listed Buildings will be protected by other policies in the Plan.

Appendix B – Late responses

Late responses to the consultation were received from the following:

Severn Trent

(Relating to Policy CC3)

Friends of Victoria Embankment

(Relating to Policy EN1/'Irrelevant to the Plan')

Mr & Mrs Randle

(Relating to Sites PA44,PA46 and PA47)

Local Nature partnership

(Relating to Policies CC1, CC2, CC3, HE1, EN1,EN6, EN7, MI1, MI3, IN2, Whole Document, Section 5, Policies Map, and Duty to Co-operate)

Nicola Wheeler

(Relating to Site PA21)

The Poor Clare Monastery

(Relating to Site PA10)

Legal & General Property (comments provided by Savills)

(Relating to Policy EE3)

David Leigh, Nottingham Liberal Synagogue

(Relating to Site PA21)

Appendix C – List of those invited to comment at Publication Stage

List of those invited to comment at Publication Stage

Organisation

A Place To Call Our Own Ltd
A4E
Abacus Developments Ltd
Abbeyfield Nottingham Society Ltd.
Aberdeen Asset Management PLC
Aberdeen Property Investors
ABS Team
Aburnet Ltd
Acacia Court
Access House
Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd
ACNA Centre
Acorn Day Centre
Acreridge Ltd
Active Communities
Adam Commercial
Addleshaw Goddard
Advocacy in Action
AECOM
Afghan Community Centre
African Caribbean Education & Training services
African Caribbean Women's Group
Age UK Nottingham and Nottinghamshire
Aldergate Properties
All Saints Parish Church
Alzheimer's Group Day Care
Amaani Tallawah (formally Peace of Mind)
AMC Gardens
AMEC Environmental & Infrastructure UK Limited
AMEC Foster Wheeler
Anchor Housing Trust
Ancient Monuments Society
Andrew Thomas Planning
Anne Staley Design Ltd.
Aphasia Nottingham
Arboretum Health Team
Arches Adventure Base
Armstrong Burton Planning
Army Cadet Force
ARP 050 Friendship Centre
Arriva Midlands
Arthritis Care Nottinghamshire
Arts Exchange
ARUP
Asda Stores Limited
Ashfield District Council

Asian Arts Council
Asian Women's Project
Asian Women's Support Group & Toddler Group
Aspbury Planning Ltd
Aspley Garden Holders Association
Aspley Library
Aspley Medical Centre
Aspley Partnership
Aspley Womens Group
Assarts Farm Medical Centre
Assembly of the First Born
Association Of Ukranians
ATIS REAL Weatherall
Aurum Holdings
AWAAZ
Azadi
Azuka
BAA Limited
Bababhu Dhaji Gurudwara
Bagthorpe Gardeners
Baha'i Community
Bakersfield Community Centre
Bakersfield Library
Balisier Court
Bangladeshi Jalalabad Community Centre
Bangladeshi Welfare Association
Bank's Developments
Baptist Church Bulwell
Baptist Church Chasewood
Baptist Church Mansfield Road
Baptist Church Queensberry Street
Baptist Church Thomas Helwys
Bar Lane Garden Holders
Barnardos Nottingham Young Peoples
Barratt Homes
Barratt Homes North Mids
Barton in Fabis Parish Council
Barton Lane Community Association
Barton Willmore Planning
Barton, Gotham & Thrumpton Parish Councils
Bartons plc
Basera House
Basford Library
Basford United FC
Bassetlaw District Council
BCM Materials
BCS College
Beazer Strategic Land
Beconn Project
Bellway Homes East Midlands

Ben Bailey Homes
Bentinck Primary School
BEST
BESTCO
Bestwood Est Community Centre
Bestwood Library
Bestwood Park Health Centre
Bestwood St. Albans Parish Council
bi Design Architecture
Bilborough Library
Bilborough Medical Centre
Bildurn Property Ltd
Biocity
Bircham Dyson Bell
Birkin Patch Residents Association
Bi-Sexual Womens Group
Bizspace
BLESMA Nottingham
Bloc Ltd
Bloor Homes
Blotts Country Club
Blue Sky Planning
Blueprint Limited Partnership
BNP Paribas Real Estate UK
Bobbersmill Community Centre
Bolsover District Council
Boots
Bootstrap Services
Boulevard United Reformed Church
Bovis Homes Limited, Central Region
Boys Brigade Nottingham Battalion
Bradbeer Planning Ltd
Bramley Hedge Parent & Toddlers
Braunstone Developments
Breakout
Breast Cancer Support Group
Breathers Self Help
BREEAM
Brian Barber Associates
Bridge Centre
British Geological Survey
British Library
British Red Cross Nottinghamshire
British Sign and Graphics Association
British Sport Trust
British Waterways
Broad Street. Centre
Brocklewood Infant and Nursery School
Brocklewood Junior School
Brodies

Brooke Smith Planning
Brother II Brother
Browne Jacobson
Broxtowe African Caribbean Social Organisation
Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe College
Broxtowe Education, Skills & Training
Broxtowe Partnership Trust
Bryan and Armstrong
Bryant Homes East Midlands
Bryden Developments
BT Openreach
BT Wholesale
BUILD
Bulwell Health Centre
Bulwell History Society
Bulwell Library
Bulwell Vision
Byrant Homes East Midlands
C.A.R.I.N4 Families
C/O Whitegate Primary School
CABE
Calabash Supplementary School
Cambridge Professional Development
Camlin Lonsdale Landscape Architects
Campaign for Better Transport
Campaign for Real Ale
Canals & River Trust
Capita Symonds
Capital One
Carers Federation, Nottingham & Notts.
Carewatch in Nottingham
Carlton Furniture
Carlton Road Library
Carringtons Solicitors
Carter Jonas LLP
Castle Cavendish
Castle Cavendish Foundation, Castle Cavendish Works
Castle Rock Brewery
Cathedral Church of St Barnabas
Caves Forum
CB Richard Ellis Ltd
CBI East Midlands Region
CBRE Ltd
CDS Development Services Ltd.
Cedar Developments
Central Education and Training
Central Fire Station
Central Methodist Mission
Centre for Ecology And Hydrology

Cerda Planning
Cerebral Palsy Sport Nottingham
CgMs Consulting
Chamber of Commerce
Charis Life Church
Charnwood Borough Council
Chat Inn
Chatsworth Developments Ltd
CHC-Land Ltd
Chemical Business Association
Child & Family Counselling Service
Childrens Health Information Centre
Chinese Church Nottingham
Chinese Community Association
Chinese Scholars and Students Association
Chinese School Nottingham
Chinese Welfare Association
Chinese Womens Association
Chinook Sciences Ltd
Chris Thomas Ltd Outdoor Advertising Consultants
Church Children & Young People Clifton
Church Of England - Southwell And Nottingham
Church of God Inc.
Church of God of Prophecy
Church of God UK
Church on Rise Park
Churches Together in Clifton
CIC East Midlands
CitiLofts Ltd
Citizens Advice Bureau, Administration Office
City Arts
City Centre Forum
City College Nottingham
Civil Aviation Authority
Claremont Primary School
Clegg Group Ltd (formerly DE Clegg Ltd)
CLG
Clifton Advice Centre
Clifton Audio Project
Clifton Hall Management Company Limited
Clifton Health Action Group
Clifton Landowners
Clifton Leisure Centre
Clifton Library
Clifton Medical Centre
Clifton Mental Health Carers Group
Clifton Village NW
Clifton Village Residents' Association
Clifton Young Women's Group
Clifton, Wilford & Silverdale Forum

Clinical Commissioning Group
Clubs for Young People
Coal Pensions Properties Ltd and RREEF UK Retail Property Fund
Colin Smith Partnership
Colliers CRE
Collins Cash & Carry
Colwick Parish Council
Commercial Estates Group
Commission for Racial Equality
Committee of the North Wollaton Residents Association
Communities and Local Government
Community Health Team for the Homeless
Community Learning Network
Compass Adult Drug Services
Concept Planning Design Ltd.
Confederation of Passenger Transport UK
Confederation of UK Coal Producers (CoalPro)
Congregation of Yadweh
Congregational Church
Connexions
Contraception & Sexual Health Services
Copyright Libraries Agency
Cornelia de Lange Syndrome Self Help
Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church
Costco Wholesale UK Ltd
Couch Perry & Wilkes LLP
Council for British Archaeology
Council of Christians & Jews
Country Landowners Association
Countrywide Homes Ltd
Courier Exchange Limited
CPRE
CPRE East Midlands
Creative Quarter
Crest Nicholson
Cripps Health Centre
Crocus Fields Community Home
Croft Plc
Crosby Homes (East Midlands) Ltd
Cute Lingerie
Cyber Café Intergration Project
D C Hoults Ltd
D G Warping
D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)
Dalton Warner Davis
Darul Islam
David Hammond Chartered Surveyors
David Lock Associates
DDEP
Deancoast

Derby City Council
Derby Road Health Centre
Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce
Derbyshire County Council
Derbyshire County Council (Environmental Services)
Derbyshire County Council (Public Transport)
Derbyshire Friends of the Earth
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Derbyshire PCT
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust
Derek Lovejoy Partnership
Derek Morris Architects
Derwent Living
Development Securities PLC
Devplan UK
DIO Operations
Diocese of Southwell
Disabilities Living Centre Nottinghamshire
Disability Matters
Disabled Peoples Advocacy Nottinghamshire (DPA Notts)
Disabled Peoples Movement
Disability Involvement Group c/o NCC EDT
DLP Planning
Donaldsons
Dove Jeffrey Developments
Downs Syndrome Children's Clinic
DP Window Cleaning
DPDS Consulting Group
DPP
Dr B Collinson
Dr B S Mehat
Dr M C Jones and Partners
Dr O P Sharma's Practice
Dr Yvvs Rao's Practice
DTZ
DTZ Piedad Consulting
Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
Dunkirk and Lenton Partnership Forum
Dyslexia Institute
E.ON Plc
Ear Foundation
East England Chinese Association
East Midlands African/ Caribbean Arts (EMACA)
East Midlands Airport
East Midlands Ambulance Service
East Midlands Chamber of Commerce
East Midlands Housing Association
East Midlands Property Owners
East Midlands Property Owners Ltd
East Midlands Regional Councils

East Midlands Trains
Eden Supported Housing Ltd
EE
EMACA Visual Arts
EMF Enquiries Vodafone and O2
Energy Saving Trust
Energywatch
English Language Home Tuition scheme
ENTA
Entec UK Ltd
Entente
Environment Agency (Lower Trent Region)
Epilepsy Action
Equality Advisory Support Service
Erandu
Erewash Borough Council
Erewash Clinical Commissioning Group
ERONDU
Escritt Barrell Golding
ESHA Developments
Exodus
Experian
Experience Nottinghamshire
Faculty of Education, Nottingham Trent University
Fairhurst
Faith in Families
Falcon Youth Group
FAME
Family First - Young Black Minds
Family Medical Centre
Fast Web Media Ltd
fch Housing and Care
Featherstone Planning & Development
Federation of Small Businesses
FFT Planning
FHP
FIANN
FIBC Building Control Services
Fibromyalgia Support Group
Fields In Trust
Fire Service Headquarters
Firmtake Ltd/Diceort Ltd
First Enterprise Business Agency
Fish Media
Fisher German
FLOYD
Focus
Forestry Commission - East Midlands Office
Forestry Commission England
Forum Building Design

Foyer Nottingham
FPD Savills
FPD Savills (Lincoln office)
Framework Housing Association
Franklin Ellis
Freeth Cartwright LLP
Freight Transport Association - Midlands
Freight Transport Association - Head Office
Friends of Kashmir
Friends of Nottingham Mental Health
Friends of SCOPE Nottingham
Friends of Victoria Embankment
Friends of Wollaton Local Nature Reserves
Full Gospel Revival Centre
Fusion Online Limited
Future Health Biobank
G & H Associates
G R Planning Consultancy Ltd
G.C. Treadgold Young And Pearce
GBCS
Gedling Borough Council
Geo Akins (Holdings) Ltd
George Wimpey East Midland Ltd.
George Wimpey UK Ltd
Ghana Union
Giant Uk Ltd
Girlguiding Midlands
Girlguiding UK
GL Hearn
Gladedale (East Midlands) Ltd
Glaption School
Gleeson Regeneration
Globe Consultants Limited
Go Digit All
Godwin Developments
Good Companion
Gotham Parish Council
GP Consortium
GP Surgery (Bailey Street)
GP Surgery (Graylands Road)
Greater Nottingham Business Alliance
Greenwood Partnership
Greenwood Sneinton Family Mc
Gregory Gray Associates
Groundwork Greater Nottingham
Guinness Northern Counties
Gujarat Samaj Nottingham
Guru Nanak Punjabi School
Guru Nanak Sikh Temple
GVA Grimley

H J Banks & Co
H M Railway Inspectorate
Hage MD and Partner
Harmony TRA
Harrislamb Property Consultancy
Hartley Road Medical Centre
Harvey Hadden Sports Complex
Harworth Estates
Headway House
Health and Safety Executive
Health And Safety Executive Chemicals, Explosives and Microbiological Hazards
Division - 5E
Heart Church
Heart Lets
Heathcote Holdings
Heaton Planning Ltd.
Hebrew Congregation Nottingham
Helical Retail
Hendon Court Development Ltd.
Henry Boot Developments Ltd
Henry Mein Partnership
Hepher Dixon
Herbert Button and Partners
Hidradentitis Suppurativa Support Group
Highbank Community Association
Highbank Over 60 Club
Highways England
Highwood Player Infant and Nursery School
Highwood Player Junior School
Hilarys Blinds Ltd
Hillside Meeting Room Trust
Hindu Temple
Historic England (East Midlands)
(East Midlands)HM Prisons - Parliamentary, Correspondence And Briefing Unit
Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council
Holmes Antill
Holy Trinity Team Ministry
Home Builders Federation
Home Builders Federation-East Midlands
Home Start Nottingham
Homes and Communities Agency
Hopewells Furnishers
House Builders Federation
Housing and Communities Agency
Human Relations Network
Humdard
Hunter Page Planning
Huntingtons Disease Association Nottingham
Hyson Green Traders Association
Hyson Green Youth Club

I H Moore Group
Ian Baseley Associates
IG Land & Planning
Ilm O Fun
Imagine Inflatables Ltd
Imperial Tobacco Limited
Independence Products Limited
Indian Womans Association
Indigo Planning
Inland Waterways Association (Notts Derbs)
Innes England
Inqlabi Development Aid
Inspired Spaces
Institute Of Directors
Inter Faith Council Nottingham
Intu Properties PLC
iPlansolutions
Ishango Science Club Nottingham
Islamic Centre Nottingham
Italian Committee
Ivana Scott
J B Holdings
J D Lane
J Greenwood and Associates
J H Walter
Jackson Design Associates
Jai Ganesh
Jameah Fatimaih
Jameah Islamia
Jamia Al Karam
Jamia E Islamia
Jamia Fatemia
Jamia Fatia
Jas Martin & Co.
Jay Bee Construction
Jephson Housing Association
Jewish Ladies Guild Nottingham
Jewish Womens Benevolent Society Nottingham
JHWalter LLP
John Carroll Leisure Centre
John Cawley Ltd
John Hiley
John Lewis Partnership
John Ryle Health Centre
Jones Day
Jones Lang LaSalle
Julie Boulby
Justine Darke
Kala Niketan Hindi School
Karibu Foyer

Karimia Institute
Kasa Kasa
Kashmir Brotherhood Council
Kealar Ltd
Ken Mafham Associates
Ken Martin Swimming Centre
Kidney Patients Association
Kosovan Albanian Community Project
Lace Market Properties Ltd
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd
Laing O'Rourke Midlands Limited
Lambery Smith Hampton
Land Registry HM
Landmark Information Trust
Landmark Planning
Langar Investments Ltd
Langridge Homes Ltd
Laseruk-Finance Company
Learn, Hyson Green
Learning Space
Leicester City Council
Leicester Housing Association
Leicestershire County Council
Leith Planning
Lenton Community Association
Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Lenton Medical Centre
Lenton Muslim Centre
Lenton Overview Group
Lenton Parish Church
Lesbian & Gay Line Nottingham University
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Association (LGBT)
LGBT Forum
LGBT Forum c/o NCC EDT
LIBRA
Litchford Estates Ltd
Lorne Estates Ltd
Lovell
Lovell Johns
Lowland Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Local Nature Partnership
Lunch Club
Mabec
Mabuhay Notts Filipino Association
Madni Masjid & Muslims Education Centre
Madni Masjid Mosque & Community Centre
Madni Mosque & Education Trust
Madni Trust
Madrassa-E-Karima
Madrissa -E- Islamia Centre
Madrissa Karimia

Make Children Happy
Malvern House
Manic Depression Fellowship Group Nottingham
Mansfield and Ashfield NHS Clinical Commissioning Group
Mansfield District Council
Mansfield Road Baptist Church
Mar City Developments Ltd
Marcity Developments Ltd
Marcity Homes Ltd
Marcus Garvey Centre
Marks and Spencer Plc
Marrons
Maryland Securities
Mason Richards Planning
Mather Jamie
McCann Homes
McCarthy & Stone Ltd
McDonald's Restaurants Ltd
Meadows Health Centre
Meadows Library
Meadows Muslim Action Group and Mosque
Meadows Muslim Centre
Meadows Partnership Trust
Meadows Youth & Community Centre
Megaclose
Melbourne Park Medical Centre
Mellers Primary & Nursery School
Melton Borough Council
Mencap Nottingham
Mental Health Awareness Project
Messrs W.T.Parker
Methodist Church Clifton
Methodist Church Grangewood
Methodist Church Sherwood
Methodist Church Womens Network
Methodist District Notts & Derby
Metropolitan Housing Partnership
Metropolitan Housing Trust (MHT)
Micro-Mesh Engineering Ltd
Midlands Rural Housing Trust
Miller Homes (East Midlands Ltd)
MIND Central Nottinghamshire
Mind Notts
Mind UK
Mitchell Dodd Chartered Surveyors
MLA
MM3 Design Ltd
Mobility Centre
MOD Strategic Planning Team
Molyneux Smith Chartered Accountants

Monarch Health Care Ltd
Monk Estates Ltd.
Montagu Evans LLP
Moore Midlands
Morgan Hill
Morris Homes (North) Ltd
Morrisons Supermarkets PLC
Mortar Developments
Mosaic Group
Mothers Union
Motor Neurone Disease Association
Mount Zion Community Centre
MP Group
Mr Peter Hemphill
Multiple Sclerosis Society Nottingham
Muslim Community Organisation
Muslim Hands
Muslim Khawateen Educational Trust
Muslim Welfare House & Masjid Abu Bakar
Muslim Womens Organisation
Myasthenia Gravis Association
Myotonic Dystrophy Support Group
N.W.R.A
NACRO
Nai Zindagi Project
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
National Deaf Childrens Society
National Environmental Research Council
National Express Ltd
National Farmers Union - East Midlands
National Federation of the Blind
National Grid
National Grid UK Transmission
National Ice Centre & Capital FM Arena Nottingham
National Planning Casework Unit
National Self Build Association
National Society Prevention Cruelty
National Trust
Natural England
NCHA
Nene Housing Association
Network Rail
Network Rail Property
New Aspley Garden Holders Ltd
New Basford Community Centre
New College Nottingham
New Mechanics Institute
New Testament Assembly
New Testament Church of God
Newark and Sherwood District Council

NG7 Training Employment Advice
NHS England
NHS Erewash Clinical Commissioning Group
NHS Nottingham City
NHS Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group
NHS Property Services Ltd
NHS Rushcliffe Clinical Commissioning Group
NJL consulting LLP
NLP Planning
NO East Midlands
NORDTRA
North British Housing Association
North Gate Court Ltd
Northern Counties Housing Association
North-West Leicestershire District Council
Nottingham CVS
Nottingham & Notts Lesbian & Gay Switchboard
Nottingham & Notts. Refuge Forum
Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Nottingham area of Ramblers Association
Nottingham Bilborough Congregation Of Jehovah's Witnesses
Nottingham Bi-Womens Group
Nottingham Black Families in Education Support
Nottingham Business Management Centre
Nottingham Business School
Nottingham Central Library
Nottingham Citizens Advice Bureaux
Nottingham City Airport Plc
Nottingham City Council
Nottingham City Homes
Nottingham City Retail Association
Nottingham City Transport
Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Nottingham Civic Society Sales Ltd
Nottingham Community College
Nottingham Community Housing Association
Nottingham Community Transport
Nottingham Constabulary
Nottingham Deaf Society
Nottingham Disabled Peoples Movement
Nottingham Elders' Forum
Nottingham Equal
Nottingham Fireplace Company
Nottingham Friends Of The Earth
Nottingham Green Partnership
Nottingham Healthcare Trust
Nottingham Hebrew Congregation
Nottingham Independent Venture
Nottingham Interfaith Council
Nottingham Islamia School

Nottingham Licensed Taxi Owners
Nottingham Local Access Forum
Nottingham North and East Clinical Commissioning Group
Nottingham Parent Partnership
Nottingham Park Estate Ltd
Nottingham Park Residents' Association
Nottingham Platers Ltd
Nottingham Post Group
Nottingham Progressive Jewish Congregation
Nottingham Property Owner Association
Nottingham Regeneration Ltd
Nottingham Society of Artists
Nottingham Tennis Centre
Nottingham Trent University
Nottingham Trent University LGB Society
Nottingham Trent University Union of Students
Nottingham University Hospitals Trust (City Campus)
Nottingham University Hospitals Trust (QMC Campus)
Nottingham Voluntary Action Centre
Nottingham Women's Centre
Nottingham Womens Training Scheme
Nottinghamshire & Derbyshire Chambers of Commerce & Industry
Nottinghamshire Association of Local Councils
Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Group
Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
Nottinghamshire City and County Employment & Skills Board
Nottinghamshire Coalition of Disabled People, Nottingham
Nottinghamshire Council for the Voluntary Sector
Nottinghamshire County Council
Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement
Nottinghamshire National Federation of the Blind
Nottinghamshire Police
Nottinghamshire Relate
Nottinghamshire Royal Society for the Blind
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
Notts County Council
Notts CTC
Notts Historic Gardens Trust
Notts Rural Partnership
Notts Vietnamese Community Project
Nurses Association of Jamaica - Nottingham
Nuthall Nottingham LLP
Nuthall Parish Council
Oakhill Group Ltd
Office of Rail Regulation
Old Highbury Vale TRA
Old Meadows Tenants and Residents Association
Older Person's Consultative and Scrutiny Forum c/o NCC EDT
One Nottingham
One Vision Partnership

Open Minds East Midlands
Orange Personal Communications Services
Osborne Clarke
OSCAR
Other Job Shops Bestwood Partnership Forum
Our Lady & St Edward's Roman Catholic Church
Our Lady & St Patrick Roman Catholic Church
Our Lady of Czeztocowa (Polish Church)
Our Lady of Perpetual Succour (Roman Catholic Church)
Our Lady of Perpetual Succour (Ukrainian Church)
Outburst
Over 60 Widows Club - Nottingham
Oxalis Planning
Pakistan Centre
Pakistan Forum Nottingham
Pakistan Friends League
Pak-Kashmir Women's Forum
Parent Partnership Service South Notts
Parkinsons UK
Parkview
Parry Dunstall Planning Consultants
Partnership Council
Patch
PATRA Inc ACDA
Paul Smith Ltd
Peace of Mind
Peacock & Smith
PEDALS
Pedestrians Association
Peel Holdings Ltd
Pegasus Planning
Pegasus Planning Group
Pensioners Rights Campaign
Pentacostal Assembly of the World
Pentecostal Church Aspley
Persimmon Homes PLC
Peter Diffey and Associates Ltd.,
Peter Tyers Associates
Peter Wigglesworth Planning Ltd
Peveril Homes Ltd
Pickering Properties Ltd
Pilgrim Church
Pilgrim Holiness Church
PJ Fletcher & Sons
Places for People
Planinfo
Planning and Design Group
Planning Bureau Limited
Planning Potential Ltd.
Planware Ltd

Play & Learn in Safety
Play Development
Pilgrim Holiness Church
Polish Roman Catholic Community in Nottingham
Poor Clare Sisters
Portland Leisure Centre
Positive Attitude
Powergen Retail Ltd
POW-Nottingham
Pregnancy Crisis
Princes Trust Nottinghamshire
Pro New Aspley Gardens Committee
Project Azadi
Punjabi Women's Association
Purearth PLC
Purico Ltd: Property and Planning
PZ Cussons
Queens Medical Centre
R G Foster Textile Machinery Ltd
Raahat Support Project for Asian Carers
Radford Bridge Road Allotments
Radford Care Group
Radford Library
Radford Local History Society
Radford Medical Practice
Radford Unity Complex
Radford/Lenton Library
Radio Trent
Radleigh Homes
Raglan Housing Association Ltd.
Rail Freight Group
Raleigh UK Ltd
Ramblers' Association
Ramgarhia Sabha Nottingham
Ratcliffe Marina
Ray Valenti Property Consultants
RBS
Redburn Holding Corporation
Redrow Homes (Midlands) Ltd
Reedgrove Ltd.
Regeneris Consulting
Relate Nottinghamshire
Renewables UK
Renewal Trust
Residential Landlords Association
Residents Against Wollaton Allotment Development
Retinitis Pigmentosa Society
rg+p Ltd
RH Developments
Rhr Medical Centre

Rippon Homes Ltd
Rivergreen Medical Centre
Riverlyn Medical Centre
Riverside Group
Riverside Housing Association
Road Haulage Association Ltd
Roger Bullivant Ltd
Roger Tym and Partners
Ropemaker Nottingham Limited
Rose Gay TRA
Roselodge Group
Roshni Asian Women's Aid Ltd. Nottingham
Roxdan Developments
Roxylight
Royal British Legion
Royal Mail Group
Royal Mail Properties
Royal Society for the Blind
Royal Society For The Protection Of Birds - East Midlands
RPS
RPS Group
RRAHAT
RSPB
RTPI
Ruddington Parish Council
Rural Community Council
Rural Solutions Ltd
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Homes
Russell Press Limited
S Collins & Co Ltd
Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Parish
Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
Saint-Gobain
Salvation Army Nottingham Divisional HQ
Salvation Army Sneinton House
Sasie Ltd
Savills
Savills (L P) Ltd
Schizophrenia Fellowship Group
Scott Wilson
Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick Ltd
Second Base
Secure Accommodation
Sedgwick Associates
Senior Internet Ltd
Services for People with Special Needs
Seventh Day Adventist Church
Severn Trent Water
Sexual Abuse Project

Shefton Youth Group & School
Shell Pensions Trust
Shelter (Nottingham)
Sherwood CC Luncheon Club
Sherwood Farms Ltd
Sherwood Health Centre
Sherwood Library
Sherwood Rise Residents Conservation Group
Sherwood Rise Surgery
Shiefton Supplementary School
Shiefton Youth Group & School
Shire Consulting
Shoosmiths Solicitors
Sicle Cell/ Thalassaemia Service
Signet Planning
Sikh Community & Youth Service
Sikh Community & Youth Service (Nottingham)
Sikh Temple
Sikh Temple Basford
Sikh Temple Lenton
Silver Birches Day Club
Silverdale Community Association
Sladen Estates Ltd
Smith Cooper
Sneinton Environment Society
Sneinton Environmental Society
Sneinton Library
Sneinton Neighbourhood Forum
Sneinton Tenants and Residents Association
Sneinton Tenants and Residents South (STARS)
Sol Homes
South Broxtowe 2020
South Derbyshire District Council
South Nottingham College
Southglade Leisure Centre
Southreef Properties Ltd
Southwell Diocesan Council for Family Care
Spawforth Associates
Speedo
Spencer Birch
Spirita
Sport England
Sport Nottinghamshire
Springfield Medical Centre
SSA Planning Ltd.
St Andrews with Castle Gate Church
St Ann with Emmanuel Church
St Anns Community Orchard
St Anns Family Centre
St Augustines Roman Catholic Church

St Barnabas Roman Catholic Cathedral
St Christophers Church Sneinton
St Cyprians Church of England Church
St Francis Church Clifton
St Hughs Roman Catholic Church
St Johns Church of England Church
St Margarets Church of England Church
St Marthas Church & Hope Centre
St Martin's Assoc. of Residents and Tennants
St Martins Church Sherwood
St Marys Church of England
St Marys Medical Centre
St Marys Roman Catholic Church
St Modwen Developments Ltd
St Mowden
St Nicholas Church Of England
St Pauls Roman Catholic Church
St Peters Church Nottingham
St Stephens Church Hyson Green
St. Ann's Library
St. Leodegarius, Basford
St. Paul's Tenants and Residents Association
Standen Homes (Holdings) Limited
Stapleford Town Council
Star Planning and Development
Stewart Ross Associates
Stoma Support Group Nottingham
Stonebridge City Farm
Stoneleigh Planning Partnership
STRAG
Strata Homes Ltd
Stratus Environmental Limited
Strawsons Holdings Ltd
Strelley Health Centre
Strelley Road Library
Stroke Association
Stroke Club
Student Events & Activities Co-ordinator
Sunrise Medical Practice
SUSTRANS
SW Planning Limited
Sweet Tastic
Sybil Levin Centre
Sycamore Development
SYPT
Tagadere (formally Positive Attitude)
Tangent Properties
Tantum Project: Access House
Tantum: Old Vicarage
Taylor Wimpey and Havenwood Construction

Taylor Wimpey Developments Ltd
Taylor Wimpey East Midlands
Taylor Young
Teenage Parent Project
Tenants and Residents Association of Dunkirk
Tennants Services Authorities
Tennyson Street Playcentre
Terence O'Rourke
Thames Water Pension Scheme
The AMBER Project
The Boots Company plc
The Church of God
The Coal Authority
The Co-operative Group
The Crown Estate
The Dale Surgery
The Diocese of Southwell & Nottingham
The Federation of Deaf People
The Forest Practice
The Garden History Society
The Georgian Group
The Guinness Trust
The Inland Waterways Association
The Issan Ghazni Partnership
The Lawn Tennis Association
The Meadows Partnership Trust
The Medical Centre
The Moore Group
The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
The National Trust
The New Aspley Gardenholders Ltd.
The Nirmala Surgery
The Nottingham Energy Partnership
The Nottingham Park Estate Limited
The Nottingham Park Residents Association
The Peacock Practice
The People's Church
The Pilgrim Centre
The planning Bureau
The Planning Inspectorate
The Ramblers Association Nottingham Area
The Religious Society Of Friends (Quakers)
The Renewal Trust
The Residents' Association of Oundle Drive and the Three Clo
The Showmen's Guild Of Great Britain, Derby, Notts, Mid So
The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
The Surgery
The Theatres Trust
The Thoroton Society
The Tree Fella

The Twentieth Century Society
The University of Nottingham
The University of Nottingham Students' Union and Nottingham Trent Students' Union
The Victorian Society
The Windmill Practice
Three
Three Valleys Housing Ltd
Thrumpton Parish Council
Tim North & Associates Limited
Tinnitus Group
Tony Thorpe Associates
Toucan Education Trust
Touch Stone Housing Association
Town Planning Consultancy Ltd
Town planning and Sustainable Development Consultants
Tracheo-Oesophagal Fistula Support Group
Transco
Travellers Education Centre
Trent & Peak Archaeology
Trent Barton
Trent Vineyard
Tribal MJP
Triumphant Church of God
Trowell Parish Council
Truelove Properties
Truelove Property and Construction Ltd
Trustees of the O'Keeffe Building Services Limited SSAS
Tubulero Sclerosis Association
Tudor House Medical Practice
Tuntum Housing Association
Tuntum: Imaani Project
Turley Associates
Uhuru Group
UK Coal
UK Property Planning
UK Regeneration
UMUADA
Union of Pakistani & Kashmiri Organisations
United Holy Church of God
United Reformed Church Mens Club
United Reformed Church Sherwood
Unity Residents Forum
university of nottingham
University of Nottingham Students' Union
University of the Third Age (Nottm.)
UoN Students Union
UPKO
Urbanissta
Urdu Association
Victoria Halls

Victoria Health Centre
Vietnamese Community Centre - Nottinghamshire
Village Vision
Vincent and Goring
Vine Community Centre
Virgin Media
Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VSP) UK/World Council of Hindus (Nott
Voice East Midlands
W A Barnes
W Westerman Ltd
Walton & Co
Waste Recycling Group
Waterloo Housing Group
Waystone Ltd
We Are Nottingham
Welbeck Surgery
West & Partners, Town Planning Consultants
West Area Parents
West Indian Sports & Social Club
Westerman Homes
Western Power
Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd.
Westleigh Developments Ltd and Sunstore International Manage
Westleigh Partnerships Ltd
Wheeldon Bros/TSS Land
Whitehead Ltd & Foulds Investments Ltd
Whyburn Group
Wilford Community Group
Wilford Grove Surgery
Wilford History Society
Willards
William Davis Ltd
Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
Wollaton Vale Health Centre
Wollaton Vale Residents Association
Woodland Trust
Working Nottingham Partnership
Wrenbridge
WYG
X-Press Legal Services
YMCA Nottingham
York Archaeological Trust
Youth & Community Services
Youth Council c/o Jon Rea (NCC)
Youth Inclusion Project

In addition to the organisations listed above, consultation letters were also sent to individuals who had previously commented or expressed interest in commenting on the Local Plan, and to occupants of properties located in close proximity to proposed Site Allocations.

Appendix D – List of Respondents at Publication Stage

List of Respondents at Publication Stage

0122 – Cllr Malcolm Wood
0169 – Malcolm Varley
0182 – The Coal Authority
0188 – Mr J Potter
0191 - Paul Brook
0225 - Pedals
0259 – Broxtowe Borough Council (BBC)
0311 – Historic England (HE)
0431 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)
0802 – Natural England (NE)
0838 – Sport England (SE)
0917 – Cllr Anne Peach
0977 – Resident’s Association Vale
1172 – Nottinghamshire Disabled People’s Movement (NDPM)
1359 – Theatre Trust
1381 – E.ON
1402 – Nottingham Action Group (NAG)
1540 – Environment Agency (EA)
1685 – Severn Trent Water (STW)
1754 – Cllr Ball A
1825 – J Lowe (New Aspley Gardenholders Ltd)
1883 – Mr & Mrs Buckley
2306 – Mr M Penn
2353 – John Moon
2366 – Teresa Herring
2367 – Mr & Mrs Hill
2409 – Friends of Victoria Embankment (FoVE)
2410 – Environment Health
2448 – Carol Mee
2452 – Gedling Borough Council
2455 – Nathan Giles
2501 – Paul Clayton
2518 – Sandra Hilton
2532 - Nichola Judd and David Rodgers
2659 – Archer R
2702 - Mr & Mrs Randle
2758 – Rev Gerry Murphy
2792 – Coal Authority
2795– Home Builders Federation (HBF)
2813 – Wilson Bowden
2989 – Ashfield District Council (ADC)
2999 – Cllr Wendy Smith
3001 – British Sign & Graphics Association (BSGA)

3006 – N Wootton
3073 – David Savidge
3160 - Intu Properties
3215 – Fretwell R
3215 – Raymond Fretwell
3219 – Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC)
3223 – Thames Water Pension (TWP)
3490 – Tom Huggon - (Open and Green Spaces Champion)
(OSGC)
3517 - Nottingham Park Estate (NPE)
3520 – Nottingham Trent University (NTU)
3523 – University of Nottingham (UoN)
3529 – Health & Safety Executive (HSE)
3530 – Highways England (HE)
3763 – Local Nature Partnership (LNP)
3590 – D2N2 LEP
3644 – National Grid
3653 – Veolia
3654 – Domic Townsend
3658 – Gemma Campbell
3659 – Joseph Kelly
3660 – Tassadaque Masood
3661 - NCC Historic Environment Record
3662 – Bryan Ayres
3663 – Ruki De Silva
3665 – Saint-Gobain
3666 – Peter Fearon
3667 – Philip Herring
3668 – Tricia Wright
3669 – Muhammad Zulfiqar
3670 – Sandfield Day Nursery
3671 – David Anderson
3672 – Colleen Jacklin
3673 – Giovanni Russo
3674 – John Bridgewater
3676 – Rebecca Greensmith
3677 – Christopher Bates
3678 – Clive Thomas
3679 – Matt Law
3680 – Eithne Molloy
3681 – Shaun Worley
3681 – Shaun Worley
3682 – Teresa Saunders
3683 – Mrs S Church
3684 – Marcin Welik
3689 - Calverton Parish Council (CPC)

- 3691 – Muller UK
- 3692 – Danuta Reszuya
- 3694 – Phil Ambrose
- 3697 – Barbara Davis
- 3698 – Robert Thatcher
- 3699 – Telereal Trillium
- 3701 – Cllr Andrew Rule
- 3701 – Cllr Andrew Rule
- 3702 – Deancoast Ltd
- 3703 – Bell Fruit Games
- 3704 – Co-operative Group
- 3705 – Jockey Club
- 3706 – Aurang Zeb
- 3707 – Trevor Hurst
- 3708 – Melisha Francis
- 3709 – Leon Riddle
- 3710 – James Thorpe
- 3711 – David Baggott
- 3712 – Kerrie Robb
- 3713 – Michael Owen
- 3714 – Stuart Walker
- 3715 – John Holdsworth
- 3716 – Glynis Garton
- 3718 – Agnieszka Komoterska
- 3719 – Dan Walker
- 3720 – Carlton Road Developments
- 3721 – Julia Williams
- 3722 – ABB Limited
- 3723 – Placedynamix
- 3724 – The Bridge Steering Group
- 3725 – Miller Birch Partnership
- 3726 – Aldi Stores
- 3727 – Marston's Inns and Taverns
- 3728 – Power Leisure Bookmakers (PLB)
- 3729 – Melbury Primary School
- 3730 – East Midlands Property Owners (EMPO)
- 3731 – Nottingham Trent University (Planning & Design)
(NTU)
- 3732 – Lynne Simpson
- 3733 – Charles Hunt
- 3734 – Shaz Brooks
- 3735 – William Watson
- 3736 – Natasha and Neil Williams
- 3737 – Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC)
- 3738 – Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA)
- 3739 – Land Securities PLC

- 3741 – Tesco Stores
- 3742 – Michael Thompson
- 3743 - Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)
- 3744 – Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC)
- 3745 – Gauher Yaqub
- 3746 – Petition
- 3747 – Elaine Bolstridge
- 3748 – Linda Hall
- 3749 – Stella & Alan Walker
- 3750 – Brailsford
- 3751 – Mohammed Khizer (Saagar Tandoori Restaurant)
- 3752 – Anonymous Resident
- 3753 – Timothy Strangeway
- 3754 – Robert Elliott
- 3755 – Nicholas Pearson
- 3756 – David Fordham
- 3757 – Alastair Smith
- 3758 – Mohammed Butt (Legends Gymnasium)
- 3759 – Ken Dyke (Roots)
- 3760 – Michael Hanby
- 3761 – Kate Bowley
- 3763 – Nicola Wheeler
- 3768 – Poor Clare Monastery (PCM)
- 3765 – Severn Trent Water (STW)
- 3766 – Legal & General Property
- 3768 – Nottingham Liberal Synagogue
- 3783 - Biodiversity Greenspace -NCC (BGNCC)
- 3786 – Imperial Tobacco and Henry Boot
- 3787 – Boots UK

Appendix E – Typical Consultation Letter, Statement of Availability of Documents and Guidance Note

Typical Consultation Letter

My Ref: LAPP GC

Cont ID:

Contact:

Email: localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk



Nottingham
City Council

Development Department
Policy & Research Team
LH Box 52
Loxley House
Station Street
Nottingham
NG2 3NG

Tel: 0115 876 4594
localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Dear

NOTTINGHAM CITY LOCAL PLAN PART 2 LAND AND PLANNING POLICIES DOCUMENT – PUBLICATION VERSION

I am writing to inform you about the publication of the Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document (also known as the Local Plan Part 2). This will help shape new development in the City over the coming years. Its purpose is to ensure that new development meets the needs of Nottingham's citizens while protecting what is best about the City.

The Local Plan sets out proposed planning policies which will be used to guide decisions on planning applications in the future, and also includes proposed site allocations for future development.

We are inviting representations from any party wishing to comment on the soundness and/or legal compliance of the document. The document and all of the representations received will then be examined by an independent Planning Inspector who will decide whether the Local Plan is sound and can be adopted.

In accordance with Government guidance, this stage of the consultation is limited to comments on whether the Local Plan is legally compliant and whether it is positively planned, justified, effective and consistent with national policy (please see the website for more guidance on what this means).

As required by Planning Regulations a 'Statement of Representation Procedure' and 'Location of Documents for Inspection' are enclosed providing details of how to view the Plan and supporting documents, and also how to submit representations.

The consultation will run from Friday 29th January until Friday 11th March 2016. All comments must be received by 5:00pm on the last day.

Copies of the Local Plan and all supporting documents can be viewed:

- On line at: www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan
- At our offices: Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG (8.30am to 4.30pm Monday – Friday);
- At the Contact Centre: Within the Central Library: Angel Row, Nottingham (8.30am-5pm Monday – Friday, apart from Thursday 9.30-5pm)

Reference copies of the Local Plan plus response forms can also be found in all City libraries.

You can comment on the Local Plan by:

- Visiting the website above and completing the on-line form or down-loading a response form;
- Emailing localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
- Requesting a response form from the Policy and Research Team at the above address or by telephoning 0115 876 4594;
- Picking up a response form from any City Library and returning it to the Policy and Research Team at the address at the top of this letter.

Please note that comments will be publicly available and cannot be treated as confidential, although address, telephone and email address details will not be published.

We would be grateful if you could include your consultee number in any correspondence, which can be found at the top of this letter.

If you would like any further information, or have any difficulty accessing the information, or would like documents in a different format, please do not hesitate to contact the Policy and Research Team using the contact details given at the top of this letter.

If you no longer wish to be included on our consultation database, please contact us to let us know.

Yours sincerely,

Dawn Alvey, Local Plans Manager

Statement of Availability of Documents

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 18, 19 & 20) Statement of Representation Procedure

Title of Document:

NOTTINGHAM CITY PART 2 LOCAL PLAN (LAND AND PLANNING POLICIES DOCUMENT) – PUBLICATION VERSION

Subject Matter and Area Covered:

The Part 2 Local Plan allocates land for new housing, employment and other uses and also sets out policies against which planning applications will be judged. The Plan includes a Policies Map which shows allocations and designations to 2028. It has been published for a period of public representation before Submission to the Secretary of State.

The Plan covers the administrative area of Nottingham City Council.

Publication Period:

Friday 29th January 2016 until 5:00pm on Friday 11th March 2016

How to make representations:

Representations can be made on-line, by email or in writing:

- On-line at: www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan
- By email: localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
- In writing to: Policy and Research Team, Nottingham City Council, LH Box 52, Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG

Representation forms are available on-line, at the above address or from:

- Nottingham City Council, Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG (8.30am to 4.30pm Monday – Friday);
- The Contact Centre, within Central Library & Contact Centre, Angel Row Nottingham (8.30am-5pm Monday – Friday, apart from Thursday 9.30-5pm)
- All City Council Libraries <http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/findalibrary>

Additionally, representation forms can be requested from the Policy and Research team at the City Council by telephoning 0115 876 4594 or emailing localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Please note, comments will be publicly available and cannot be treated as confidential, although address, telephone and email details will not be published.

Further notification:

Your response may include a request to be notified of the future stages in the plan

preparation including notification that:

- The Local Plan has been submitted for independent examination;
- The recommendations of the person appointed to carry out the independent examination of the Local Plan have been published;
- The Local Plan has been adopted.

Nottingham City Council

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 18, 19 & 20)

Location of Documents for Inspection

NOTTINGHAM CITY PART 2 LOCAL PLAN (LAND AND PLANNING POLICIES DOCUMENT) – PUBLICATION VERSION

Copies of the Part 2 Local Plan, Policies Map, Sustainability Appraisal Report, Equalities Impact Assessment, Statement of Consultation and other supporting documents are available for inspection at:

Loxley House
Station Street
Nottingham
NG2 3NG
(8am to 5pm) Monday to Friday (excluding holidays)

and at:

Contact Centre within Nottingham Central Library & Contact Centre
Angel Row
Nottingham
NG1 6HL
(8.30am-5pm Monday – Friday, apart from Thursday 9.30-5pm)

Reference copies of the Part 2 Local Plan and Policies Map have also been placed in all City Libraries. Opening times for the libraries can be found at:
<http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/findalibrary>

An electronic copy of the Part 2 Local Plan and Policies Map, supporting documents and guidance on how to make a representation are available to view on the Council's web site: www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan

Paper copies of Part 2 Local Plan and Policies Map and supporting documentation, can be requested (for a charge) from the Policy and Research Team at the city Council by telephoning 0115 876 4594 or emailing localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk