

Eastside



Contents

1.0	Name of Document	1
2.0	Purpose of the SPD.....	1
3.0	Persons/bodies/groups consulted	1
4.0	Ways in which consultation was undertaken	1
5.0	Public Meetings	2
6.0	Representations	3
7.0	Sustainability Appraisal	3
	Appendix 1: Note of Public Meetings.....	5
	Appendix 2: Summary of comments received, officer responses and proposed changes during the consultation.....	17

1.0 Name of Document

1.1 Eastside Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

2.0 Purpose of the SPD

2.1 The SPD will provide planning guidance for the Eastside area of Nottingham. The guidance supplements policies contained within the adopted Nottingham City Local Plan. Over recent years development within this area has been dominated by student accommodation to serve the growing number of students at the City's two universities. This SPD aims to set out a vision for the area, identifies constraints and opportunities and provides guidance on the type and form of development expected in the area...

2.2 SPDs are documents which add further detail to the policies in the Local Plan. They can be used to provide further guidance for development on specific sites, or on particular issues. SPDs are capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions but are not part of the statutory development plan.

2.3 This SPD is supplementary to the Local Plan Part 2 (2020) and the Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategy (2014). The SPD conforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and once adopted will be a material consideration when determining planning applications.

3.0 Persons/bodies/groups consulted

3.1 Consultation has been undertaken with statutory bodies, local businesses, citizens, agents and developers, wider interest groups and stakeholders, local councillors, and Nottingham City Council officers. Letters providing details of the consultation were sent to all contacts on the Local Plan database of consultees.

4.0 Ways in which consultation was undertaken

4.1 Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the City Council's Interim Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), 2020. Comments on the draft SPD were initially invited for a 10-week plus period from Wednesday 14 July to Friday 24 September 2021. The consultation period was then extended to 29 October 2021, followed by a further extension until 3 December 2021. In both cases, the extension of time was to allow for two public meetings to take place (see section 5 below) and to give people enough time to make comments following these.

- 4.2 Paper copies of the consultation documents and response forms were made available at the City Council's deposit points; Nottingham City Council's offices at Loxley House, Station Street; The Dales Centre Library; St Ann's Valley Library; and Victoria Leisure Centre. The Nottingham Central Library and the Local Studies Library were both closed for the duration of the consultation.
- 4.3 The document was available to view and download from the City Council's web site (www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/eastside-spd). Comments could be submitted using an online survey form (SNAP), or comments could be emailed directly to the Planning Policy Team (localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk). Where necessary, comments could also be sent by post to Loxley House.
- 4.4 The consultation was also advertised on the Engage Nottingham Hub webpage for the duration of the consultation period.

5.0 Public Meetings

- 5.1 An e-mail invitation was sent on 8 October to all those on the Local Plan consultation database informing them of an online public consultation meeting on Monday 18 October 2021, from 6-8pm. The meeting was facilitated by Michele Campbell of Eclectics UK. It was designed to discuss the vision for the Eastside area and provide an opportunity to become informed about the work the City Council are doing to ensure any future transformation in the area brings a positive and sustainable change. At the event, there was an initial presentation by Councillor Woodings, followed by the opportunity for participants to ask questions, make relevant comments, share ideas and find out how to remain informed and engaged in the development of the guidance.
- 5.2 A second public meeting was held on 15 November 2021, from 7-9pm. This was held in-person at The Carousel, Hockley.
- 5.3 Please see **Appendix 1** for a summary of the meetings.

SHAPE THE FUTURE OF

NOTTINGHAM EASTSIDE



Monday 18th October 6-8pm



PLEASE REGISTER TO
ATTEND THIS EVENT:
www.co-place.org/events

ONLINE
EVENT



6.0 Representations

- 6.1 In addition to comments made at the public meetings, a total of 171 representation comments were received from 48 interested parties. All comments have been considered and a number of changes to the SPD were proposed as a result. The table in **Appendix 2** sets out the comments made, and the City Council's response to them, together with any recommended changes to the draft document.

7.0 Sustainability Appraisal

- 7.1 Undertaking a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a statutory requirement/ process, which must be undertaken for any new planning document in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). The purpose of an SA is to assess the economic, social and environmental impacts of projects, strategies or plans, so that the preferred option promotes, rather than inhibits sustainable development. In addition to an SA, European directive 2001/42/EC (commonly referred to as Strategic Environmental Assessment or SEA), requires that Local Authorities undertake an "environmental assessment" of any plans and

programmes they prepare that are likely to have a significant effect upon the environment.

- 7.2 The requirements of the SEA have been incorporated into the SA for the Local Plan Part 2 - 2020(LAPP). The process appraised social, environmental and economic effects. It was undertaken from the start of the LAPP process and through its various preparation stages. In doing so it ensured that the decisions made on policies contributed to achieving sustainable development. Furthermore, the SA recommended some changes to ensure that the LAPP was as sustainable as possible. The SA has facilitated the evaluation of alternatives and also considered the cumulative, synergistic and secondary impacts of the LAPP policies and sites.
- 7.3 The SA also demonstrated that the Plan was an appropriate approach when considering reasonable alternatives and, where negative impacts were found, suggested mitigation measures overcome them. Monitoring arrangements were also proposed to ensure that the impact of the policies can be properly evaluated. Accordingly, as an SA was undertaken on the LAPP, a separate SA is not required for this document.
- 7.4 Full details of the SA process, and methodology can be found at www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan.

Appendix 1: Note of Public Meetings

18 October 2021 online meeting

Points raised	City Council response	Amendment to SPD Yes/No)
All available space already given over to PBSA. Council need to listen to those affected by their decisions rather than ignore them.	Development schemes will continue to come forward within the Eastside area. Views and comments have been taken into account during the consultation on the Eastside SPD and during the planning application processes.	N
The Charrette that happened previously seemed like real dialogue and the Council were enthusiastic about making the area an exemplar of how a carbon neutral, aspirational gateway to the city could be.	The City Council has developed a Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning Guidance Document which requests that a Carbon Reduction Energy Statement be completed for all new developments of 10 or more homes (or commercial development above 10,000m ²) to ensure that all new development is as sustainable as possible. The Statement should cover energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable design and construction. Reference to the requirements of this document will be made in the SPD.	Y
Where can they fit mixed housing in the area? There is no space left now that student blocks have filled the area.	Development schemes will continue to come forward within the Eastside area. The guidance within the document will be developed to continue to seek a balance in the type of development that occurs.	Y

High rise student accommodation has literally created a wall between the city and St Ann's/Sneinton. Massing will create dark wind tunnels where nothing will grow, and existing trees knocked down.	The guidance in the document has been improved to ensure that this will not happen.	Y
Cutting off area by building a wall of high-rise buildings.	The guidance in the document has been improved to ensure that this will not happen.	Y
The area needs a cheap supermarket.	Comments noted. There is a Tesco within Victoria Centre and a Lidl on Carlton Road which are both close to the Eastside (within 20 minute walk). The document will seek to promote a balance in the type of development that comes forward in the Eastside and there is nothing that will preclude new supermarkets in the area from being developed where appropriate.	N
Key views have gone following approved applications.	Key views are set out in the Urban Design Guide and continue to be protected through the SPD.	N
Independent shops can't make a go of it given the low wages of the majority of the local population.	SPD cannot address this issue.	N
Give skateboarders a proper skate park.	There is a dedicated skate park at King Edward Park approximately 0.25km from Sneinton Market.	N
Dead space when students have left.	Comments noted. Text added into the SPD to refer to Local Plan Part 2 Policy DE1(c) to ensure that active street frontages will be encouraged to increase natural surveillance along streets.	Y
Balance of area shifting to a student accommodation 'ghetto'.	The guidance within the document has been developed to continue to seek a balance in the type of development that occurs.	Y
Transport links designed to put existing residents at risk accessing their city.	The guidance in the document has been development to ensure that this is not the case.	N

<p>Improve link from St Ann's over and under Shelton St.</p>	<p>The City Council has recently finished consulting and will soon start construction on walking and cycling improvements along St Ann's Well Road. This work will include changes to the junction of the Wells Road with Shelton Street to make it easier and safer for pedestrians to negotiate the junction and reduce vehicle speeds.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Huntingdon St/Lower Parliament St need to be made more pedestrian friendly.</p>	<p>As part of the Transforming Cities Fund, the City Council is investing in improved walking and cycling facilities in the city centre. Currently this work is taking place on London Road but later in the year will progress onto Fisher Gate and its junction with Lower Parliament Street. This will provide both pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities and a significant improvement for links into the both the Eastside and Island Quarter areas.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Nothing to suggest affordable housing is priority.</p>	<p>Affordable housing is a priority. Local Plan policies ensure that S106 Agreements are used to secure affordable housing contributions from new development where it is not appropriate to provide it on site.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Are we trying to retain and sustain our existing residents and communities?</p>	<p>Yes, this is the case.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Is there going to be a guarantee that there will be no more PBSA built in the area or is this just 'desirable'?</p>	<p>It is not possible to stop any further PBSA in the Eastside area. The City Council has a statutory obligation to meet local housing needs for all sections of the population. Monitoring information will continue to be used to review the levels of student housing in areas and Local Plan policies will be reviewed. The guidance in this</p>	<p>Y</p>

	document addresses the interplay between the relevant local plan policies to try and ensure that other forms of development are not compromised in the Eastside.	
Will there be no more PBSA approved, or only if it can be converted to regular flats, if necessary?	Policy HO6 in the Local Plan already requires all developers to show how their PBSA schemes can be made adaptable for alternative residential uses. The SPD also encourages this in the development guidance section.	N
A lot of time and work has already gone into this process, it's frustrating.	Comments noted.	N/A
There is a sense of déjà vu, this discussion has gone on for years.	Comments noted.	N/A
Will there be someone working with developers to check and ensure 'sustainable' working practices? There's a lot of disconnect between ideals and practice.	The City Council has developed a Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning Guidance Document which requests that a Carbon Reduction Energy Statement be completed for all new developments of 10 or more homes (or commercial development above 10,000m ²) to ensure that all new development is as sustainable as possible. The Statement should cover energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable design and construction. These statements will be assessed by planning officers. Reference to the requirements of this document will be made in the SPD.	Y
No more student housing.	It is not possible to prohibit further PBSA in the Eastside Area. The City Council has a statutory obligation to meet local housing needs for all sections of the population. Monitoring information will continue to be used to review the levels of student housing in areas and Local Plan policies will	N

	be reviewed. The guidance in the document addresses the interplay between the relevant local plan policies to try and ensure that other forms of development are not compromised in the Eastside.	
Is there a list of issues the local community feels need to be solved?	Not aware of such a list being produced, other than the views collected via various engagement events.	N/A
Dismissing views of residents and local businesses.	Local views gave impetus for the SPD document to be produced.	N/A
Good that connection to District Heat Network is mentioned, where possible. Can a requirement that for new buildings that don't get connected use heat pumps instead of gas boilers?	The City Council has developed a Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning Guidance Document which requests that a Carbon Reduction Energy Statement be completed for all new developments of 10 or more homes (or commercial development above 10,000m ²) to ensure that all new development is as sustainable as possible. The Statement should cover energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable design and construction. Reference to the requirements of this document will be made in the SPD.	Y
Can area be extended to include Promenade and Campbell St?	These streets fall within a primarily residential area and it is not anticipated that there would be any significant development proposals here. Furthermore, the Sneinton Market Conservation Area boundary covers this area and so the policies in the Local Plan would therefore be sufficient.	N

<p>The SPD contains many commendable sentiments, but how will the SPD influence planning decisions when evidence from Planning Committee shows 2 buildings impinging on Key View A - both were approved. (and that is saying nothing about the Bendigo Building).</p>	<p>The SPD document can only be used as a material consideration in planning decisions once it is adopted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>When can we expect to see the SPD deliver on the ground? Will the Vision connect to the built environment?</p>	<p>The SPD document will be used as a material consideration in planning decisions once it is adopted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Can the SPD adopt a more robust or clearly defined policy on open space and the provision of the same, which fairly reflects and proportionately matches the increase in floor area in the SPD area for future developments? Provision of upkeep and improvement to Victoria Park and the Rest Gardens should be included, as the only green space in the area. Dedicated S106 money would be nice.</p>	<p>SPDs cannot be used to formulate planning policies, they are guidance documents only. St. Mary's Rest Gardens, Victoria Park and Sneinton Square provide good local public open space for recreational and leisure activities. New development will be expected to protect and improve these assets and increase connectivity to them.</p> <p>There is very little opportunity to provide any more meaningfully sized open space areas although this doesn't mean that the streetscene within the Eastside can't be improved or enhancement to the existing parks. There is substantial greenspace planned around the former Broadmarsh shopping centre.</p> <p>In terms of S106 Agreements, Open Space contributions can be spent on improving local space within Nottingham but National Planning Guidance and caselaw indicates that such monies should be spent improving open space within the locality of the development which provided them.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>The actions of the Planning Department are not matching their words. A high-rise wall, creating dark wind tunnels where nothing will grow and a physical wall between the city and St Ann's/Sneinton have been granted planning permission - how does this fit with the vision if a green, attractive city? And how does this fit with our carbon neutral aspirations?</p>	<p>The guidance in the SPD seeks to avoid this scenario. The vision and carbon reduction section in the SPD have been strengthened.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Will the SPD be amended to reflect current planning consent. In particular, the pending Bendigo building? It will have a big impact on the numbers of student accommodation currently reported.</p>	<p>Yes, the SPD has been amended to show planning consents granted since the draft SPD was produced including the planning consent for the Bendigo building.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>There's lots of mentions of development of new offices in the document. Should this perhaps be reconsidered in light of the move to home/hybrid working? The fear is new offices would be unutilised and later converted to poor quality housing via permitted development.</p>	<p>Planning applications for new offices will be reviewed and considered on a case by case basis in line with Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Any plans for flats / accommodation for young single working professionals?</p>	<p>The guidance in the SPD document follows Local Plan policies in seeking to diversify the housing stock in the Eastside area.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Nottingham was always a low-rise City and Eastside has become a high-rise ghetto.</p>	<p>The guidance in the document aims to ensure that development is built at appropriate heights.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>It's a shame that such a high proportion of the student accommodation has been consented. The numbers of accommodation cited in the SPD are alarming and don't even reflect consented or pending consents.</p>	<p>The SPD aims to ensure that there is more of a balance in the type of development in the Eastside area in the future. The development guidance in the document will continue to be developed.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Please be ambitious for something better for the people of Nottingham. If the same decisions keep being taken in the same way, we're just going to end up with a generic carbon copy city.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD document is being written for the Eastside area, taking into account a lot of detailed analysis work that is contained within the document. Guidance will continue to be developed.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Can you please adopt a policy whereby you fine landlords for urban vandalism, for leaving building vacant above ground level? That would be a very bold policy and force landlords to begin to maintain their properties.</p>	<p>The control of vacant properties in this manner is beyond the remit of this SPD.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>I can't see how the student accommodation that has been approved recently contributes positively to the Carbon Neutral agenda. The shadows, wind tunnels, and</p>	<p>The City Council has developed a Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>microclimates they create simply offer the reverse. Is any reinvestment from these developments ring fenced for this area?</p>	<p>Guidance Document which requests that a Carbon Reduction Energy Statement be completed for all new developments of 10 or more homes (or commercial development above 10,000m²) to ensure that all new development is as sustainable as possible. The Statement should cover energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable design and construction. Reference to the requirements of this document will be made in the SPD.</p>	
<p>Is there anything that can be done to ring-fence spaces dedicated to start-up businesses? I'm aware of the existing facilities available in the city, but as someone who started up a modest business from nothing, I found that the entrepreneurs could be better supported. There are many creative minds in Nottingham who would benefit from city centre facilities, (perhaps assessed by revenue?). Maybe this is beyond the remit of the SPD. Empowering young graduates to get set up will provide many benefits to the local economy, but there are still many barriers to entry.</p>	<p>The Economic Development Team at the City Council will be pleased to assist in finding properties for businesses in the Eastside area.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Are the public open space contributions that PBSA developers make under S106 actually spent within the local area?</p>	<p>Open space contributions can be spent on improving local space within Nottingham but are generally spent improving open space within the locality of the development.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

15 November 2021 meeting at The Carousel, Hockley

Panel: Mat Anderson: Chair of Victoria Park Resident Association, Paul Seddon: Director of Planning and Regeneration NCC. Karen Shaw: Local Plans Manager NCC, Laura Alvarez: Urban Design and Conservation Officer NCC

Introduction

Explanation that the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is a tool that sets out a framework for developers; it fits within the legal policies, government guidelines, and local plan looking 15 years ahead. It aims to clarify an appropriate balance of types of housing and

development, geographic links into the area, and sustainability of new buildings. The balance of types of housing has not been achieved and with the surge of student housing it is now time to look ahead. The document does not create new policies but instead amplifies existing policies. The SPD will provide developers with a vision which will act as a guide for future. The SPD does not give power to say no to student housing, instead it will help to lay out a vision and help influence further plans. SPDs are often used and are often quoted in appeals. Multiple examples of how SPDs have been previously used, especially if it comes to Section 106 money and how it is spent locally. Community consultation helps make the SPD more robust.

Main points raised	City Council response	Amendment to SPD Yes/No)
Circumstances change so quickly and the SPD is missing the wider context of the city; importance of getting the balance right - students bring a lot of money, but at the same time they seem contained, having their own gyms and bars and so on, isn't the SPD just creating red tape to create balance?	We need to focus on a range of needs, the process is hugely complex; we are further accountable to our government. There is a Local Plan for the entire City, focused on the next decade; the local SPD creates and clarifies more detail, but cannot override the existing overarching policies or create new ones.	N/A
The plan mentions goals around sustainability for commercial properties but not for student housing - can other types of buildings be made to comply?	We are constrained by the government policy and there is another document that focuses on carbon reduction in buildings housing more than ten people which is applicable. Explained that the governmental policy in regard to planning sustainability is lacking. Reference to be made, in the SPD, to the Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning Guidance Document.	Y
Can we strengthen the language regarding sustainability in the SPD?	The City Council has developed a Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning Guidance Document which requests	Y

	that a Carbon Reduction Energy Statement be completed for all new developments of 10 or more homes (or commercial development above 10,000m2) to ensure that all new development is as sustainable as possible. The Statement should cover energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable design and construction. Reference to the requirements of this document will be made in the SPD.	
Some current developments are the result of previous policies - high rises have been already okayed and therefore the SPD feels too late. Disappointing that critical mass is already reached.	Development will continue to come forward in the future. On adoption, the SPD will be a material consideration in any future planning applications in the Eastside area it cannot however set new policy only provide guidance as to how existing policies may be applied and balanced..	N
Agree that the document is late in the day. The thoughts around sustainability and mixed community feel like an afterthought, and Covid has changed how people live which is not taken into consideration. The SPD is not innovative and appears political.	The SPD has been redrafted to include reference to the City Council's Reduction in Carbon in New Development Interim Planning Guidance.	N
A mixed population is not going to be achieved. The area needs one and two bed apartments to encourage young professionals to move into the area. Student housing appears to all be moved from terraced housing in Lenton to high rises in Huntington Street and Lower Parliament Street.	The SPD aims to diversify housing in the Eastside area and specifically seeks 1 or 2 bed accommodation to ensure a wider offer of housing.	N
The SPD accepts all the planned developments and does not outline local improvements.	The SPD sets out how local needs can be provided for.	
Anti-social behaviour by students has been observed. This is due to students transitioning the area and not being residents or being encouraged to be. A wind tunnel has been created down Huntington Street that will prevent any improvement such as trees; if we are having a conversation can we still make changes?	A lot of work went into negotiating the limited height of the buildings on Huntingdon St. The market is pushing for taller buildings and there are constant negotiations over height which is a material consideration and	N

	considered when applying existing policy. The City Council is working with both universities to develop a Student Living Strategy to deal with anti-social behaviour and noise issues amongst a whole range of other actions.	
Difficulties as a market trader with the new developments on Sneinton Market; feel let down and unsupported by the Council and that all power lays with the developers. There is a disconnect between locals and the Council.	Comments noted. Issues passed to Economic Development Team.	N
By the time the market has settled it will be too late due to the delay between planning and the occupation of properties.	Comments noted.	N
The basis for the development is the local universities which are changing and the local economy, in general, is not developing at the same speed as housing projects.	The City Council has no powers to intervene or control the growth of universities and students. The amount of student bedspaces being delivered is monitored very closely by the City Council.	N/A
Bike lanes need to be extended to connect to the Broadmarsh bike highway.	The City Council has recently consulted on an update to Nottingham's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). This document outlines the Council's investment programme for walking and cycling over the next 10 – 15 years, depending on funding levels provided. The City Council is aware are that this improvement is needed on the network and will ensure these comments are taken on board as part of the LCWIP consultation. The LCWIP identifies that all major road corridors that have not already been upgraded to high quality cycle and walking infrastructure require	

	investment. The order in which these are delivered will depend on a number of factors such as consultation, funding, deliverability, design resources as well as other works planned on the network.	
Need safe cycle lanes to connect Eastside to the London Road and Lady Bay Bridge as the current routes are very perilous.	Please see response above. This comment has also been forwarded to colleagues working on the LCWIP.	
Red light cameras are needed to prevent accidents.	Red light cameras are managed by the police. There is a current consultation to make the entire city centre a 20 miles per hour zone.	N
What are the next steps?	Please submit feedback on the SPD via email to localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk All comments will be analysed and the document will be changed in line with comments received.	N/A

Appendix 2: Summary of comments received, officer responses and proposed changes during the consultation

Points raised in the Response	NCC Response	SPD Amendment
Housing for elderly should have provision of 2 bedrooms, for visiting carers and or family, latest safeguarding devices be installed and with associated green oasis.	Comment noted - the SPD includes that "Proposals should seek to diversify the existing mix of housing provision; in line with Policy HO1. Particular emphasis will be placed on Policy HO1(3) to deliver flats of two or more bedrooms".	N
Health Centre within easy distance of elderly housing, with provision of GP services with associated wellbeing facility such has dentistry, podiatry, etc.	Comments noted - Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust has been consulted as part of the consultation process.	N
Bus stop(s) with shelter, with a service that links with inter city buses, railway station, the city centre and including connection to the Medilink bus between QMC and City Hospital.	Comments noted and passed to Public Transport Policy, Public Transport Operations. The Eastside area is served by frequent radial bus routes between the city centre and the Carlton, Netherfield and Gedling areas. Buses to hospitals are available with interchange in the city centre.	N
Generally supportive of the SPD and its aims to redress the balance of student housing accommodation in the Eastside.	Support noted.	N
Would like citations to current initiatives and policies to be included within the document to give reassurance there is evidence of the steps being taken to realise the stated aims of the SPD (e.g. work towards 20 min neighbourhood, sustainability etc.).	Noted. Citations of current initiatives and policies are included within the relevant paragraphs. An example is the reference to the City Council's Reduction of Carbon in New Development Informal Planning Guidance (June 2022), whereby all new planning applications for development of 10 or more homes or commercial development of 1,000 m2 and above will be require to be supported by a Carbon Reduction Energy Statement	Y

	demonstrating how the proposed development contributions towards the City Council's carbon neutral objective. The Statement should cover energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable design and construction.	
Would like the Council to consult it and any other chartered residents and business (or otherwise) associations, directly on Planning Applications of note made in its area, particularly strategic planning or development amendments and proposals with more than 25 housing units, or developments with a social, educational, commercial or health element.	Comments noted. Individuals and groups can sign up to both the Local Plan Database to be consulted on planning documents, and also to be consulted on planning applications on the City Council's webpages.	N
Would like the SPD area to be redrawn to include its area (Promenade, Robin Hood Terrace, Campbell Grove, Lamartine St, Foljambe and Harcourt Terraces, William Bancroft Building, Victoria Park and St Mary's Rest Garden).	This is a primarily residential area and it is not anticipated that there would be any significant development proposals in this area. Furthermore the Sneinton Market Conservation Area boundary covers this area and so the policies in the Local Plan would therefore be sufficient.	N
Would like NCC to ensure that payments made for planning approvals are spent on the improvement and maintenance of the SPD area.	In terms of S106 Agreements, it is not possible to state that all monies will be retained as that is not how the system works. Each case is determined on its own merits with contributions being requested depending on the likely impacts. For open space contributions these are normally spent locally, but other contributions such as Affordable Housing may be spent across the city where there are sites available/need].	N
The Existing Land Use map (p15) should include areas of recreation and public open space	Land use map to be removed.	Y
Paragraph 10.25 - we welcome the observation about the "wall of buildings" and stress that it has this quality from all other aspects, not just the east as stated in the SPD.	Not proposed to change this wording due the east view being the dominant view (owing to topography) and views being less impacted when viewed from other parts of the city.	N

Paragraph 11.1, welcome the aspiration for a 20min neighbourhood but evidence or citation of achieving such is missing from the SPD.	20 minute neighbourhood section has been redrafted and also cross-referenced in the Mixed Use section.	Y
The approved Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) developments have no conditions attached that will increase health or recreational provision in the area and we would welcome it if monies attached to planning consent of pending or future PBSA is spent providing resources to help achieve the 20 minute neighbourhood for all, including the forecast increase in population.	S106 Agreements are secured for affordable housing and open space contributions from PBSA developments. We are not able to introduce any further planning changes via a supplementary planning document. Changes to these arrangements would need to be made and part of a review of the Local Plan.	N
Paragraph 11.3 – suggest including provision for additional green spaces, community health facilities or food production facilities.	Agreed.	Y
Paragraph 11.10 protection of existing tree stock should be a consideration.	Agreed. Paragraph amended as suggested.	Y
Paragraph 11.16 + 11.17 need amending to reflect up-to-date planning consents in the area. Also empirical, independent evidence that "demand is strong".	Updated as suggested. The Council does monitor demand and undertakes an annual vacancy of student accommodation. Vacancy levels have consistently remained less than 2%. The pipeline of future PBSA is also monitored.	Y
Paragraph 11.19, welcome this observation which reflects our position that further student housing has the potential to impact negatively on the area. We would like to point out that the statement in 11.19 has been made without including the numbers of students brought into the area by PBSA developments approved since the drafting of the SPD.	The City Council only has access to the up-to-date number of student households in an area, derived from Council Tax data. This data is used to assess concentrations of students in an area.	N
Student PBSA Schemes map (P35) needs to reflect current approved schemes.	Agreed. Map to be updated.	Y
Paragraphs, 11.27 & 11.28, would like to see a commitment to the continued preservation and improvement of local open space and recreational areas (2 parks and market square).	Agreed. Amendments to paragraph 11.28 made.	Y
No written comments made, only multiple choice questions populated.	Incorporated when analysing the multiple choice questions/comments.	N

<p>Nottingham needs 7,000 student accommodation and 17,000 new homes, yet it has the smallest boundary. It's not rocket science.</p>	<p>Disagree that Nottingham needs 7,000 bedspaces.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Should aspire to sustainable green development enhancing environment for people and nature.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Section on sustainability enhanced.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>More mixed housing. Cap number of student beds overall as well as the number of student beds per building.</p>	<p>The vision in the SPD states "there will be a variety of high quality housing, attractive to a wide range of households". It is not possible for the City Council to cap the number of student beds overall (as the City Council is required ensure enough provision for housing for all sections of the community), or student beds per building.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>The area could be improved by making it accessible for people with disabilities.</p>	<p>Section 11 sets out the principles of the 20 minute neighbourhood which is about creating attractive, interesting, safe, walkable environments in which people of all ages and levels of fitness are happy to travel actively for short distances from home to the destinations that they visit and the services they need to use day to day – shopping, school, community and healthcare facilities, places of work, green spaces, and more. These places need to be easily accessible on foot, by cycle or by public transport – and accessible to everyone, whatever their budget or physical ability, without having to use a car.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Continue to invest in the Sneinton Market area to make it as vibrant as possible.</p>	<p>Although the Creative Quarter organisation has been dissolved, the City Council will continue to explore and support any funding opportunities to provide investment into the area. The Nottingham City Council Events Team, Economic Development Team and the Property Team are currently engaging with tenants in the Eastside Area to understand their needs and deliver positive outcomes.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Make access on foot to Sneinton Market from the city centre a priority to encourage more footfall.</p>	<p>The SPD's Vision states that new and enhanced pedestrian routes will be created between the Eastside and City Centre. The Council will assemble existing and potential new sources of infrastructure funding in creating high quality public realm and co-ordinate safe pedestrian, cyclist and traffic movement. New development will be expected to strengthen and improve the safety of these established routes through improved pedestrian and cycle priority junctions and crossings.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Protect and accentuate all heritage buildings as far as possible.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Eastside and in particular Sneinton Market Conservation Area has unique heritage and character and the SPD recognises the importance that any new development should enhance and reinforce this sense of place. The area has a number of significant historic buildings, including some listed buildings, all of which should be protected and enhanced.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Make a clear vista from Sneinton Market to Victoria Park.</p>	<p>A clear vista from Sneinton Market to Victoria Park already exists.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Hold back on approving any more student accommodation and instead create spaces for small businesses or for new, energy-efficient family homes.</p>	<p>The SPD emphasises the importance of creating a balance of uses with the Eastside.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>There is too much student accommodation in the city. It is very difficult to find somewhere affordable to live as a young professional, landlords and Council want to give housing to students. Council needs to invest in the existing local communities who will continue to live here. Disgusted that student accommodation is being built on Sneinton Market.</p>	<p>The SPD emphasises the importance of creating a balance of uses with the Eastside but does not wish to prevent any further student development.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Nottingham needs 7,000 more student flats and needs to make 17,000 houses in its very small boundary. The solution is to build upwards just for the city, have more students out of residential zones and free up more houses therefore the housing/student flats targets decrease.</p>	<p>Adopted Local Plan policies aim to provide sufficient purpose built student accommodation, to ensure a balanced housing stock overall. The heights of developments are assessed in accordance with planning policies, including those design policies concerned with building heights</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Nottingham has enough parks. Stop thinking about turning potential developments into parks and squares.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>A large supermarket close to the City Centre is much needed. A large park/green space would also be very beneficial as there are not many places to go for a walk/run.</p>	<p>There is a Tesco within Victoria Centre and a Lidl on Carlton Road which are both close to the Eastside (within 20 minutes walk). There are also existing open spaces including Victoria Park and the St Mary's Rest Garden. There is very little opportunity to provide any more meaningfully sized open space areas although this doesn't mean that the streetscene within the Eastside can't be improved or enhancement to the existing parks. There is substantial greenspace planned around the former Broadmarsh shopping centre.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Water Efficiency is not referenced as a key outcome. Severn Trent would highlight that water efficiency measures can help reduce energy consumption and help to mitigate flooding.</p>	<p>Local Plan policies cover water efficiency and the Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning Guidance document requests that a checklist is completed to ensure that all new development is as sustainable as possible. SPD has been amended to reflect this new guidance document.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Severn Trent recommend that a reference to the Drainage Hierarchy (Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80) is incorporated into sustainability paragraphs (around 11.6/11.7) to help ensure that the most outfall is utilised for each development.</p>	<p>Drainage Hierarchy to be referenced.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The council is encouraged to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day.</p>	<p>It is considered that this optional requirement should be considered as part of the Local Plan review process. Existing local plan policies will apply; Local Plan Part 2 Policy CC3 (Water), requires that brownfield sites should achieve as close to greenfield runoff rates as possible and must achieve betterment to existing runoff rates. A minimum of 30% reduction in runoff rates should be achieved unless not technically feasible or not viable.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>New commercial developments should aim for BREEAM Excellent, this should be a minimum of Excellent/aim for Outstanding to demonstrate exemplar net zero development.</p>	<p>In line with Local Plan Part 2 Policy CC1 wherever technically feasible and viable, the Council will require non-domestic developments of 1,000 square metres of floorspace or above to achieve “Very Good” in BREEAM assessments and negotiate for “Excellent” where viable and feasible. Reference will be made to the Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning Guidance (in the SPD's Sustainability Section) which sets out expectations in this regard.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>A commitment to reuse materials on site where possible as part of the redevelopment (decrease waste).</p>	<p>Sustainability Section to be amended to include reference to the Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning Guidance document which requests that a Carbon Reduction Energy Statement be completed for all new developments of 10 or more homes (or commercial development above 10,000m²) to ensure that all new development is as sustainable as possible. The Statement should cover energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable design and construction.</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>SPD mentions connecting to District Heat Network where possible. However if this is not possible, I think there should be a focus on other forms of low carbon heating / heat pumps (in line with the new Heat & Buildings Strategy) (rather than e.g. gas heating).</p>	<p>Sustainability Section to be amended to include reference to the Carbon Reduction in New Development Interim Planning Guidance document which requests that a Carbon Reduction Energy Statement be completed for all new developments of 10 or more homes (or commercial development above 10,000m2) to ensure that all new development is as sustainable as possible. The Statement should cover energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable design and construction.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Congratulated on the content and aspiration displayed in the document and pleased that local bus services are recognized as being so important to the vitality and prosperity of the area.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Page 45 of the document displays a map with Hockley shown as a 'potential pedestrianized street.' A major City Centre bus stop is provided in Hockley with comprehensive infrastructure including raised kerb, shelter, bus timetable information and real time display. NCT would not wish to lose this facility. I hope the proposal can be modified to either exclude the pedestrianization of Hockley or make it clear that access with be maintained for local bus services.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Any changes requiring amendment to existing bus infrastructure would only be undertaken in consultation with relevant bus operator.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Conygar is supportive of the SPD and endorses the development principles and objectives of the document. Conygar recognises the negative impact of student housing monopolising land-use in the Eastside in relation to regeneration. Student accommodation would benefit from a more even distribution in other areas of the City Centre where it can be accompanied by an appropriate mix of complementary land uses and located in new and re-purposed buildings in order to maximise the regeneration potential.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Supportive of the SPD due to regeneration potential in relation to the creative industries, transport links, improved public realm and open space and independent retail opportunities.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Welcome the draft Eastside SPD, in particular its recognition that there are serious difficulties in the area in respect to active travel, especially to and from Sneinton and St Ann's into the city centre.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Changes to improve permeability set out in the Proposed Transport Infrastructure Plan (page 45) should be identified as priorities in Section 12. Improvements should be consistent with LTN1/20.</p>	<p>Reference is already made in paragraph 12.4.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The SPD should further emphasise the need to make the A60 less hostile to cyclists, including cycling commuters. We advise a 20 mile per hour speed limit for this and associated roads, in particular Glasshouse Street.</p>	<p>Reference is already made in paragraph 11.45.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Support the proposal to pedestrianise Union Road, but the SPD must not fail to consider cyclists, and should design infrastructure consistent with current guidance (Local Transport Note 1/20, Gov.UK). There is a compelling need for improved walking access across the main road at the principal junctions.</p>	<p>Support and comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The cycle cage on St Ann's Street is generally full and obviously not big enough for existing let alone future traffic. Section 106 agreements should address this lack of capacity.</p>	<p>Unfortunately there are no plans to expand the cycle cage. Funding such as S106 can provide capital funding to install but the City Council cannot take on revenue costs at the moment such as CCTV and maintenance which are associated with the hubs. Officers will continue to monitor the St Ann's hub due to it being used for bike storage by nearby residents rather than as a parking facility for people coming into the city centre.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>1 Cairns Street (the Victoria Works site) is pivotal to the SPD because it provides a rare opportunity for new public open space along the main axis of travel between St Ann's and the City centre/Victoria Centre .A new building should not exceed the current footprint and the opportunity should be taken to secure new public open space (green infrastructure) with established trees.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>The impact of PBSA development discussed in section 11 needs to include the fact that such development will be lightly used for large parts of the year, with consequences for the safety of any pedestrian routes which are associated with such development. We support the need for active frontages at ground floor level so that natural surveillance is provided year round.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Text added into the SPD to refer to Local Plan Part 2 policy DE1 (c) to ensure that active street frontages will be encouraged to increase natural surveillance along streets.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>In para 11.30 it would be better if 'where possible' was deleted from 'Walking routes should, where possible, be lined with active ground floor frontages'.</p>	<p>Delete "where possible" from paragraph 11.30.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>In the sentence beginning 'Blocks fronting..' 'should provide' should be replaced by 'must provide'.</p>	<p>Language consistent with SPD remit.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>In para 11.31/32 'should seek to incorporate pedestrian routes' seems weak. It is not clear what 'the back of the footpath line' means. These aspects should be clarified and strengthened.</p>	<p>Delete "seek to" from paragraph 11.31.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>In para 11.34, electric charging points for e-bikes should be added.</p>	<p>Add "electric charging points for e-bikes" to paragraph 11.34.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The draft SPD is vague about the specifics of green infrastructure (GI) and no new potential sites for GI are identified. Nottingham LAF considers that Union Road should be 'greened' rather than converted to hard standing</p>	<p>The importance of GI in achieving a '20-minute neighbourhood' is outlined in paragraphs 11.27 and 11.28. Comments noted for Union Road.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>We note that both the Executive Summary and the Key Outcomes include the protection and enhancement of heritage assets. We are therefore disappointed that there is no mention of the historic environment within the vision, which underpins the guidance for the future development of the Eastside Area.</p>	<p>"and the Historic Environment" to be added and the end of bullet 4 under paragraph 6.1.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>For each tall building proposal it is important to identify all heritage assets that may be affected on the basis of an appropriately defined study area, which includes heritage assets whose setting may be affected, which may be at some distance from the site. We suggest that this advice should be incorporated into the SPD.</p>	<p>Make reference as suggested to paragraph 11.26.</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>The eastside of the city is in real danger of becoming a student ghetto with the pending Bendigo Building and Brook Street development threatening to fundamentally change the demographic of the area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Annual monitoring of student numbers and the provision of purpose built student accommodation is undertaken in order to ensure the appropriate level of provision is made in accordance with Local Plan policies seeking to ensure an appropriate and balanced mix of housing is secured. The SPD seeks to achieve a balance of uses within the area.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>More protection should be offered to the rare green spaces around this area.</p>	<p>Areas of Open Space are protected by the Local Plan designation of being within the "Open Space Network". This includes Victoria Park, St Mary's Rest Garden.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Whilst there is much to support in the Eastside Supplementary Planning Guidance, Nottingham Civic Society takes issue with the way Key Views and Vistas are being safeguarded in this document. View 'corridors' are being too tightly constrained and not living up to the spirit of the City Centre Urban Design Guide's original intention with respect to the historic skyline of Nottingham City Centre.</p>	<p>The SPD accurately reflects the key views and vistas in the Urban Design Guide. The SPD does not seek to prescribe widths of view corridors and the extent to which a development affects views and vistas would be the subject of detailed assessment in the context of specific development proposals.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The A60 inner ring road is a significant barrier to active travel east/west and changes to improve permeability set out in the Proposed Transport Infrastructure Plan (page 45) should be identified as priorities in Section 12.Improvements should be consistent with DfT Local Transport Note 1/20</p>	<p>Include reference to "A60 inner ring road is a significant barrier to active travel east/west" paragraph 11.43.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The SPD should further emphasise the need to make the A60 less hostile to cyclists, including cycling commuters. This should include a 20 mile per hour speed limit for this and associated roads, in particular Glasshouse Street.</p>	<p>Include reference to "make the A60 less hostile to cyclists, including cycling commuters" paragraph 11.45.</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>We support the proposal to pedestrianise Union Road, but the SPD must not fail to consider cyclists, and should high quality design infrastructure consistent with current DfT guidance (LTN 1/20).</p>	<p>Support and comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Support the proposals in Section 11 (Development Framework) that development in the Eastside area should be consistent with the aim of achieving the 20-minute neighbourhood concept, with compact neighbourhoods, so that people can safely access everyday facilities within easy cycling or walking distance this should include well-connected paths, streets and spaces, to help achieve greater permeability of development which, along with safer road layouts, reduced levels of motor traffic and lower and well-enforced speed limits are vital to helping to promote active travel.</p>	<p>Support and comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>These connections should include external links, as well as ones within the Eastside area, and including City Centre area links, Island Site links, and ones to and from the Eastern Cycle Corridor, as well as the planned improvements on St. Ann's Well Road and Carlton Road. Future highway changes should support all of these particular aspirations as well as the general aims of becoming a 20-minute neighbourhood and implementing increasingly important wider appropriate low-carbon travel solutions.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Reference already is made in paragraphs 11.46, 11.49, 11.50 and 12.4.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Suggested broad theme for inclusion within the SPD; - Protection put in place for natural light in the parks. Shadows from the approved Bendigo building and existing BT cover both parks in winter months Building materials used should be more light reflective.</p>	<p>Cannot retrospectively resolve issues with approved developments. Developments are assessed on a case by case basis in accordance with Local Plan policies. Taller buildings will require more detailed assessments of their impacts on key views and sunpath studies will also be required as appropriate to assess potential overshadowing.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Suggested broad theme for inclusion within the SPD; The parks are neglected and need improvement including reinstating some original heritage features.</p>	<p>Changes made to paragraph 11.28 to ensure that new development protect and improve open space assets. Opportunities to be explored for funding improvements via S106 monies.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Suggested broad theme for inclusion within the SPD; Student accommodation should be built to be easily changed into residential accommodation.</p>	<p>Policy HO6 already requires all developers to show how their PBSA schemes can be made adaptable for alternative residential uses. The SPD also encourages this in the development guidance section.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The SPD area is situated in flood zone 1 therefore the lead local flood authority (LLFA) will be the relevant authority to comment on the surface water for future development proposals.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The Eastside area is situated within source protection zone (SPZ) 3. Any new developments should ensure that groundwater quality is protected as part of the development proposals.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>We welcome that biodiversity net gain will be required for new development within the SPD development area. Opportunities for wider environmental gain should also be looked into as part of future developments such as SUDS which can also offers opportunities to improve water quality as well as provide additional habitat.</p>	<p>The SPD already confirms at para 11.7 that all developments should consider incorporating SuDS and utilising these to achieve multiple benefits e.g. biodiversity, carbon capture etc.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The Plan on p19 and paragraph 11.40 refer to our buildings on Union Rd and St Marks St as having been Locally Listed. Some months ago following detailed expert inspection by Consultants we submitted a report showing the Council's analysis of the buildings to be incorrect. Council Officers have now conceded the buildings do not meet the threshold for Local Listing yet the Draft SPD still shows them as such.</p>	<p>Local List records to be updated and SPD revised in accordance.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Students will end up in PRS schemes due to rents and supply/demand issues and there will be knock on effects in other parts of the City.</p>	<p>The Council has no control over students renting in the private rental market and this can include small flats/houses class as C3 (up to 2 separate households in the same property). It is true that there are supply issues and insufficient student accommodation with a rising student population and hence students will look across the housing market to meet their accommodation needs. This is why the Council promotes PBSA schemes in appropriate locations to provide additional supply to sustainable, secure student accommodation that can better manage issues such as waste/noise etc.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>SPD Vision is supported.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Eastside is an entirely reasonable location for student accommodation as it is central, accessible and in close proximity to the university.</p>	<p>Policy HO5 sets out locations that are suitable for additional Purpose-Built Student Accommodation and this includes large parts of the City Centre including the area covered by the Eastside SPD. However, over recent years development within this Area has been dominated by student accommodation to serve the growing number of students at the City's two universities. The SPD seeks to promote an appropriate balance in the type of housing in the Eastside Area, and ensuring that a wider mix of uses can be accommodated, in line with Local Plan objectives to serve the needs of all Nottingham's citizens.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Reword para: 11.19 as follows: "Given the existing high levels of concentration in the Eastside area, it is likely <u>possible</u> that further student housing has the potential to impact negatively on the character of the area, the local context and levels of amenity...." Each site should be assessed on its own merits and in our view the use of the word 'like' essentially seeks to pre judge application proposals.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Development Framework section of the document has been amended.</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>The seeming weight afforded to the supporting text of Policy HO5 at Paragraph 4.49 in the Local Plan Part 2 is concerning. Supporting text is not afforded the same weight as actual policy text, which in this case is clear that sites within the City Centre (of which most of the Eastside SPD area overlaps with) are appropriate for student accommodation. In this respect, we would direct the Council's attention to Chichester DC v Secretary of State (2018) which confirms that a distinction should be drawn between policy and supporting text i.e. the supporting text is not explicitly part of the relevant policies.</p>	<p>Comments noted. SPD has been redrafted and contains a new Development Guidance section.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Do not agree that student accommodation runs contrary to Policy RE1 and RE3. Council should take a more proactive in allocating sites and areas for specific uses or use CPO powers to bring forward schemes.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Planning Guidance section has been amended.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>SPD is overstepping the normal remit of SPDs</p>	<p>Comments noted. SPD has been redrafted and contains a new Development Guidance section.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Has the City Council conducted a capacity audit of where student accommodation could be located according to Policy HO5. If not demand amongst students for accommodation will increase pressure on HMOs.</p>	<p>The Council does monitor student numbers and accommodation. In particular an annual vacancy has shown the vacancy has consistently remained less than 2% (currently 1.1% for 2021-22). The pipeline of future PBSA is also monitored.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>P38 11.38, the provision of indicative building heights for potential redevelopment sites is helpful but should not prejudice individual development proposals coming forward which would be informed and supported by a range of detailed assessments covering design, heritage and townscape</p>	<p>Comments noted - the indicative building heights should be used to inform any new development proposals but they will need to be supported by detailed assessments including site/context analysis, heritage and townscape analysis, views analysis etc.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>11.46, this paragraph should refer to the plan on page 45 not the plan on page 43.</p>	<p>Agreed. Update page number.</p>	<p>Y</p>

Representations are submitted in the context of a pending pre-application with Nottingham City Council – ref 21/01847/PREAPP. This pre-application submission relates to proposed amendments to consent ref 19/02566/PFUL3 at the Site of the Gala Club, St Ann’s Well Road, Nottingham.	Noted.	N
SPD Vision is supported.	Support noted.	N
Our client’s proposal would support this criterion, by strengthening and improving the routes around the perimeter of the site.	Noted.	N
Our client’s scheme has been carefully considered so as to not comprise a ‘large monolithic form’, which might exacerbate the suggested ‘large barrier between the City Centre and adjoining neighbourhoods’.	Noted.	N
The Eastside is an entirely reasonable location for student accommodation as it is central, accessible and in close proximity to the university	Policy HO5 sets out locations that are suitable for additional Purpose-Built Student Accommodation and this includes large parts of the City Centre including the area covered by the Eastside SPD. However, over recent years development within this Area has been dominated by student accommodation to serve the growing number of students at the City’s two universities. The SPD aims to redress the balance by diversifying the housing stock in the Area, and ensuring that a wider mix of uses can be accommodated, in line with Local Plan objectives to serve the needs of all Nottingham’s citizens.	N

<p>Reword para: 11.19 as follows: "Given the existing high levels of concentration in the Eastside area, it is likely <u>possible</u> that further student housing has the potential to impact negatively on the character of the area, the local context and levels of amenity...." Each site should be assessed on its own merits and in our view the use of the word 'like' essentially seeks to pre judge application proposals.</p>	<p>Comments noted. SPD has been redrafted and contains a new Development Guidance section.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The seeming weight afforded to the supporting text of Policy HO5 at Paragraph 4.49 in the Local Plan Part 2 is concerning. Supporting text is not afforded the same weight as actual policy text, which in this case is clear that sites within the City Centre (of which most of the Eastside SPD area overlaps with) are appropriate for student accommodation. In this respect, we would direct the Council's attention to Chichester DC v Secretary of State (2018) which confirms that a distinction should be drawn between policy and supporting text i.e. the supporting text is not explicitly part of the relevant policies.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Development Guidance section redrafted.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Do not agree that student accommodation runs contrary to Policy RE1 and RE3. Council should take a more proactive approach in allocating sites and areas for specific uses or use CPO powers to bring forward schemes.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Development Guidance section redrafted.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>SPD is overstepping the normal remit of SPDs and restricting new PBSA proposal, and such a policy shift should be taken forward in a revised Local Plan policy.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Development Guidance section in SPD has been redrafted.</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>Has the City Council conducted a capacity audit of where student accommodation could be located according to Policy HO5. If not demand amongst students for accommodation will increase pressure on HMOs.</p>	<p>The Council does monitor student numbers and accommodation. In particular an annual vacancy has shown the vacancy has continually remained less than 2% (currently 1.1% for 2021-22). The pipeline of future PBSA is also monitored.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The scheme complies with paragraph 11.31.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Paragraph 11.46 should refer to the plan on page 45 not the plan on page 43.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be amended.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>For the citizens of the area, not just full of students. Small markets, food shops, small businesses. No more student accommodation.</p>	<p>Comments noted. SPD document aims to diversify types of development in the area.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Very generic ideas around food.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>N</p>

Should aspire to sustainable green development enhancing environment for people and nature.	Noted. SPD contains requirements for carbon reduction and sets out guidance on greenspace and biodiversity in accordance with the Local Plan.	N
Less focus on student accommodation. What happens if there is as possible, a massive over supply of student courses and accommodation?	The council undertakes annual monitoring of student numbers and the provision of purpose built student accommodation. This approach helps the council to understand student housing requirements in order to ensure appropriate levels of supply match demand. In addition, as part of proposals for new scheme, developers have to show that there is sufficient demand and that their scheme are adaptable to alternative residential uses if there were no demand for student accommodation.	N
No recorded coal mining features within the Eastside area, therefore, no specific comments to make.	Noted.	N
There is little in the plan that refers to meeting people's spiritual needs. Young people have become more prayerful in the light of the environmental and coronavirus crises. How will these needs be met?	This issue is beyond the remit of the SPD.	N
Has there been any consultation with religious communities?	Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the councils Statement of Community Involvement and statutory requirements for SPD consultation.	N

<p>There is insufficient detail on the environmental aspects. There is evidence from Leicester University that show that personal wellbeing is enhanced when you can see a tree from your home. How will such evidence be incorporating into the planning?</p>	<p>The SPD provides a vision and development framework for the future development of the Eastside area. This anticipated future development will be assessed through the Development Management process in accordance with Government and Local Plan Policies, including those specifically relating to environmental issues, including the appropriate provision of landscaping/trees etc and Net Biodiversity Gain.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Comments are restricted to this property as follows: 1. Identified opportunities for future development; and 2. Existing land uses</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>We support the identification of the Victoria Health Centre as a future development opportunity. However, the Victoria Health Centre is currently in healthcare use and there are no plans to redevelop the site for any NHS Property Services Limited, Registered in England & Wales No: 07888110 alternative uses. The site is expected to remain in healthcare use and the wording of paragraph 8.4 should be amended to include allowance for the continued and future provision of healthcare facilities.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD provides a general framework/vision for the Eastside area, and does not contain any specific proposals to the referenced building. It is therefore not considered necessary to add any further specific text in this regard.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Page 15 of the draft SPD includes an illustration of the existing land uses in the area. This diagram identifies the Victoria Health Centre as a 'Other Commercial (inc. industrial, workshops, storage depots)' use. We do not consider that this identification is accurate. The Health Centre is more akin to the 'Community/Religious' allocation shown on this map (green shading). We respectfully request that the Victoria Health Centre allocation on the Existing Land Use map is amended to reflect this existing use.</p>	<p>The descriptions of land uses set out on the illustration referred to provide general, rather than specific, descriptions of areas. This has no effect on particular land uses within individual properties or development opportunities.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>We would like the council to commit to the following: Committing to a majority (over 50%) of rooms in further student accommodation developments being classed as “affordable”, where “affordable” is defined as not exceeding the average price of UK student accommodation (currently £146 per week according to Save the Student). Ensuring accessible and affordable transport options linking the area and the University of Nottingham’s University Park Campus. Ensuring that student voice/feedback is involved in all further steps of the process of building new student accommodation. This means inviting the University of Nottingham Students’ Union to be involved in any future consultations, working groups and committees where appropriate. Ensuring the University of Nottingham Students’ Union is involved in the decision-making process when choosing between potential accommodation providers. Committing to picking providers who demonstrate that they do not charge exorbitant/extortionate rents or hidden fees to tenants.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Council policy with regard to housing stock and affordable housing provision issues is governed by policies within the adopted local plan and in accordance with relevant Government guidance. Consultation is undertaken in accordance with the Councils Statement of community involvement. Members of the public, landowners, developers and other stakeholders are able to comment on planning applications and comments received are taken into account as the application is determined.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>More sophisticated accommodation hub with less or no students. Flats that are suitable for families along the European model with provision for shops people need. Already we have too many small shops that only offer food at high prices deterring people living in the city centre without a car.</p>	<p>Comment noted - the SPD includes that "proposals should seek to diversify the existing mix of housing provision; in line with Policy HO1. Particular emphasis will be placed on Policy HO1(3) to deliver flats of two or more bedrooms".</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Page 45 of the document displays a map with Hockley shown as a ‘potential pedestrianized street.’ A major City Centre bus stop is provided in Hockley with comprehensive infrastructure including raised kerb, shelter, bus timetable information and real time display. NCT would not wish to lose this facility. I hope the proposal can be modified to either exclude the pedestrianization of Hockley or make it clear that access will be maintained for local bus services.</p>	<p>There are no current detailed proposals for Hockley becoming a “Pedestrianised Street” so it is difficult at this stage to provide details on how access arrangements would work. However, any proposals which are developed in the future will require the involvement and engagement with local residents, businesses and NCT.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>The Salvation Army has not been named as a Key provider of Community support and spiritual support. We are a Christian Church and should be listed as such along with our Muslim Friends who have their mosque listed as a Religious establishment. We feel that we should not be left out in the provision of helping to create this new environment especially in terms of supporting the student population round us that will obviously grow. We need support perhaps financially and through forums to make sure we offer the right kind of approach to the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of the localities population both now and in the future. Adapting our building or supporting our mission would be great amongst the very helpful and keen developers.</p>	<p>Comments noted. SPD amended to include reference to the Salvation Army.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Church people travel to the City to worship, they are finding it more and more difficult to do so as the car parking is taken away. Lower Parliament street, Beck Street and Brook Street car parks have all gone. Old people in their 70 and 80's are having to park quite a distance way and finding it difficult to walk. Buses are not as frequent on a Sunday and our whole church has and will continue to be affected by this. It would be helpful if you can bring into your plans a solution for the churches in the area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Proposals for individual developments will be required to provide appropriate levels of car parking.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The Mosque has a underground car park, the other two churches have car parking, we have an Island of road all around us.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The topic of the SPD is unlikely to have major effects on the natural environment. No specific comments but consider the following; Biodiversity Net Gain, Green and Blue Infrastructure.</p>	<p>Biodiversity and green infrastructure are already part of the SPD.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Suggest the concept of 'Nature-Based Solutions' (e.g. green roofs and walls, street trees and SuDS) is introduced in the SPD's section on Green Infrastructure and how enhancing resilient ecological networks play an important role in aiding climate change adaptation.</p>	<p>Reference to be made in GI Section.</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>It would be useful to cite the Green Infrastructure proposals under discussion for the redevelopment of the Broadmarsh site and the value that St Ann's bring to Eastside and how these would form part of the evolving GI network.</p>	<p>Reference to Broadmarsh and Island Site GI proposals to be added under GI section in SPD.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might makes a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts. For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die.</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended to add "Enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment" to the key outcomes in Section 5. Nottingham City Council's Design Quality Framework provides applicants with a series of guides to help you make better design choices for their building project and to meet Nottingham City Council planning requirements more easily. The framework is in line with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and the National Design Guide.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Some SPDs require Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment.</p>	<p>Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Assessment carried out for the Local Plan and SPD is covered by these.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The SPD is out of date</p>	<p>The SPD has been updated.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The document incorrectly states at 7.1 that "The Eastside SPD area is located within Nottingham's Creative Quarter..." This statement is untrue. The northern section is in fact a tall buildings zone, it is only the southern portion that falls within the Creative Quarter.</p>	<p>SPD amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>Aspirations for the northern portion of the Eastside will be limited by existing planning policies and a whole raft of recently granted permissions. It is misrepresentation to imply otherwise. Any continuing attempt to further manipulate the development of this area beyond existing planning powers would seem absurd.</p>	<p>It is not the intention of the SPD to manipulate the development of the Eastside area beyond existing planning powers.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The adoption or even proposed adoption of the draft SPD could be seen as an exercise in plausible deniability on behalf of NCC. A document to refer to when the reality does not meet aspiration providing the 'we did our best' defence, in the full knowledge that the document was already 'holed below the waterline', before its possible adoption.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>It remains my experience and well evidenced conclusion that this Supplementary Planning Document, like so many Nottingham City Council aspirations, has been overwhelmed and made irrelevant by the deeply disturbing revelations of the last 3 years at NCC, particularly for me those concerning other bodies ("partners") associated with NCC during the period it pursued its probably financially suicidal "Commercialisation Programme". The words "partner" and "partnership" can frequently be found in NCC records, and those words have a definitive meaning. I am of the view that there may have been an historic disregard to the dangers of conflicts of interest arising between NCC public servants covered by the Nolan Principles, and NCC's expanding numbers of "partners"; moreover, I have discovered no evidence nor been given any reassurance to the contrary. I respectfully suggest NCC, overseen by its Improvement and Assurance Board, look closely at what I suggest above in relation to "partners" and the potential for unaddressed conflicts of interest, whilst also parking any thought of moving forward with the SPD at this time.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Both the LAPP and ACS emphasise the City Centre as places for student accommodation.</p>	<p>ACS states that housing should be varied and does not exclusively say student accommodation within the City Centre but other forms of residential development. Whilst the LAPP encourages PBSA in the City Centre that</p>	<p>N</p>

	is subject to compliance with other relevant policies	
Urban Design Guide refers to the possibility of building 30 storeys within Eastside and predominant heights of 6 storeys and above.	UDG actually states "it is anticipated that most tall buildings will not exceed 25 or at the most 30 storeys however there may be scope to justify a taller structure in this area provided that it is of exceptional design quality". The SPD also identifies the Victoria Works Site as potential site for a taller building. The UDG identifies the Eastside predominant heights as 6-storeys but also states "these rules do not override consideration of the building's context especially in conservation areas and schemes affecting the setting of listed buildings".	N
SPD is restrictive in terms of not according with the 2009 Urban Design Guide and tall buildings. The SPD is contrary to government objectives for housing and development in City Centres, the Core Strategy and also aspects of the Local Plan Part 2. SPD is going beyond remit and should be a DPD.	SPD is appropriate policy response and provides more detail than contained within the Local Plan.	N
Request a rewrite of the SPD to consider the general approach to suitable potential sites with the Eastside.	SPD has been redrafted and contains a new Development Guidance section.	Y
Assert that good quality student schemes can come forward with activity at the lower level, having regard to character and townscape of the area and heritage interests. The SPD should contain a more positive approach to the area and opportunities it represents.	Agree.	N
We support the Vision particularly the creation of new and enhanced pedestrian routes and pedestrian/cycle priority junctions, the SPD has clear synergy with our strategy in this regard.	Support noted.	N
Should a key outcome be the improved Health and well-being? of existing and future residents.	Add to key outcomes.	Y

<p>We support the concept of the Eastside area becoming a 20-minute Neighbourhood (para 11.1) - This guidance includes active design as referenced above</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Is there a potential to improve access in to/through St Marys Rest Gardens and then Victoria Park from the north?</p>	<p>Due to existing properties backing onto St Mary's Rest Gardens along the north boundary there is limited opportunity for this. However, existing access from the north into Victoria Park can be accessed via Robin Hood Terrace.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>It is intended that the SPD will deliver high quality housing. The occupiers of new development, especially residential, will generate demand for sporting provision. The existing provision within an area may not be able to accommodate this increased demand without exacerbating existing and/or predicted future deficiencies. Therefore, Sport England considers that new developments should contribute towards meeting the demand that they generate through the provision of on-site facilities and/or providing additional capacity off-site. The level and nature of any provision should be informed by a robust evidence base such as an up to date Sports Facilities Strategy or other relevant needs assessment. Clearly in this case Victoria Leisure Centre falls within the SPD area has an assessment been undertaken to understand if the leisure centre can accommodate any growth in demand? Other sports facilities will be located outside of the area but within an appropriate catchment distance what evidence is available to understand the impact on these facilities? Are any new facilities required in the area? Sport England is concerned that the Sport and Physical Activity Strategy which was completed in 2015 was intended to finish in 2019 has not been renewed or updated. NPPF para 98 advises that planning policies should be based on robust and up to date information and that policies should plan positively Para 93 (NPPF2021)</p>	<p>The SPD does not introduce new policies, it provides guidance on existing policies. Planning applications will therefore be determined against the extant policies in the Local Plan Part 1 and 2 concerning open space and sports facilities.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Due to the nature of the development aspirations and the location of the Eastside Area, we consider that the proposals will be unlikely to result in any material impacts on the operation of the SRN. We would however expect that as larger sites which have the potential to generate significant demands progress through the planning process, they be supported by Transport Assessments to ensure that the likely traffic impacts are appropriately assessed.</p>	<p>Comments noted. All planning applications will be subject to assessments.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>I can feedback as advised below but to help with my feedback wondered if you or anybody in the planning team can help with a few Q's: Could any leisure centre specific parking be factored in nearby/rear of the centre? There's an old brick wall that was previously part of the old Victoria Baths – any idea if this will have to be retained or will it be demolished as part of any work, any who does the wall belong to? Is it the Leisure Centre still or is it somebody else's? If ours, could we use it for marketing material/artwork to showcase there's a leisure centre next door? Graffiti is a huge issue in the area and the front of our building is being targeted daily – could some kind of communal graffiti area be factored in?</p>	<p>Comments noted and passed to Neighbourhood Services colleagues.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Broadly supportive of this document and the additional information it provides to guide development in the area. In particular we welcome the Vision which includes providing opportunities for leisure and cultural uses.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Support the Key Outcomes including providing opportunities for creative uses to flourish and ensuring a range of workshops and studios.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>There is a rapidly growing creative community in Nottingham East, but a rapidly shrinking landscape from which they can work. I know many who are now considering leaving the area, or have already, following systematic closures of affordable workspaces. Considering that this is the Creative Quarter I am quite concerned for its future.</p>	<p>Rents have increased in the Eastside Area due to a constrained in supply of units seen in recent years. This has been as a result of many factors including relaxing of planning laws to allow conversion of office buildings to resident uses and developers in the area are seeking opportunities to develop and getting more return on investment for other uses. The Economic Development Team at the City Council always meet with businesses and individuals, to understand needs and requirements and work with them to help find suitable premises.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Witnessing suitable and often one-of-a-kind Council-owned properties being sold for immediate profits to apartment developers. Need to put a stop to auctioning off community spaces (such as Sneinton Community Centre) in favour of providing space for the displaced and economically challenged creative community.</p>	<p>The review of Council owned property assets stems from the Council's Together for Nottingham Recovery and Improvement Plan Refresh October 2022 with the disposal of assets being covered by the Asset Disposal Strategy. The disposal of assets is required to achieve an appropriate portfolio balance together with realising capital receipts to meet the Council's commitments within the capital programme. The Asset Rationalisation Programme exists to include proper process for declaring properties surplus where they are evidenced to no longer meet the Council's needs; disposal of surplus assets can then take place in accordance with the Asset Disposal Strategy or the Community Asset Policy. The future use of surplus assets, where there is change of use, re-development or new development, is a matter dealt with separately, by Nottingham City Council as Local Planning Authority.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Draft is deficient in a number of respects and fails to meet the minimum requirements for SPD. Thus, it is considered to be poorly evidenced and justified, selective, subjective, arbitrary and inconsistent in its provisions.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Development Guidance section of the SPD has been redrafted.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The Objector supports in principal the 'Vision' (Section 5) and 'Key Outcomes' (Section 6) and does not disagree with the Area Description (Section 7) and Regeneration Context (drawing particular attention to Paragraph 8.4</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>In Section 9, 'Development Opportunities', the Plan on Page 13 (entitled 'Approved Schemes [a description which omits reference to the identified development opportunities]), showing, amongst other things, 'Potential Future Development Opportunities' is selective and arbitrary in its identification of sites. We object in particular, to the omission from this Plan the street block including the Objector's property bounded by Huntingdon Street, Rick Street, Glasshouse Street and Kent Street, which appear illogical in context and is not explained</p>	<p>Section 9 to be removed.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Section 10, Area Analysis is acceptable as far as it goes, however the Plan ('Existing Land Uses') is crude and incomplete and does not provide for categories of development that encompass discrete uses above different ground floor uses, such as Offices above Shops, as occurs at Huntingdon House.</p>	<p>Existing Land Use Plan to be removed.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The commentary on Townscape and Heritage at 10.6 et seq. is not disputed.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Objection is raised to Paragraph 10.12 and to the following Plan on Page 19 (titled 'Heritage Assets'). Thus the Objector continues to dispute the local listing of Huntingdon House which appears to have been selected on the basis of faulty and inadequate evidence and is not therefore objectively justified. Moreover, this and other similar designations appear to have informed the aforementioned selection of development opportunities - omitting sites occupied by 'heritage assets', which is wholly unnecessary, as there is no reasons to expect that redevelopment cannot be undertaken whilst conserving the significance of genuine and valuable assets without occasioning substantial harm thereto.</p>	<p>The wording of the SPD accurately reflects the heritage status of the assets, including buildings where an initial assessment has resulted in a recommendation to add a building to the local list, but that building has not yet been added. The SPD does not replace or override the council's formal process to add buildings to the local list. It is acknowledged that it may be possible to develop a site that includes a heritage asset, after due consideration of heritage value but in the absence of such site-specific analysis it is not considered to be appropriate for the SPD to identify such sites as locations where significant scale of change is envisaged.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The Objector does not disagree with the 'Key Views' discussed at 10.14 et seq. but considers that the 'Key Vistas' supposed to "link these key landmarks" (and identified on the 'Key View' Plan at Page 21) are far too broad, generalised and inadequately justified and evidenced and it is not</p>	<p>The 'Key Vistas' are long views where you get a sense of the form and character of a significant part of the city. The Vista from Windmill Hill is identified</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>clear how this designation will be applied in practice to individual development proposals in practice. This seems to be a recipe for blanket limitations on such developments. The selection of 'Landmarks' also seems to be arbitrary.</p>	<p>within the Nottingham City Centre Urban Design Guide.</p>	
<p>As regards 'Urban Form' (Paragraphs 10.22 et seq.), the Objector is deeply concerned about the commentary at 10.25 and 10.26 and the implications of this commentary and the 'Building Heights Analysis' Plan on Page 27. Once again the document appears to be pre-empting certain forms and heights of new development, which need to be considered on their individual merit. The claim that post 2004 development "has created the impression of a wall being formed between the City Centre and adjoining neighbourhoods" and the proposal that "New developments should look to preserve and enhance the existing urban grain and must avoid a large monolithic form which will perpetuate the physical and psychological perception of a large barrier between the City Centre and adjoining neighbourhoods" are wholly subjective, unevidenced, and somewhat hysterical statements which have the potential to be used to prevent otherwise worthy development proposals. This kind of overwrought phraseology has no place in SPD or other planning documents.</p>	<p>A number of concerns have been received through recent engagement events from local residents and also the Nottingham Civic Society have said that recent development "has created the impression of a wall being formed between the City Centre and adjoining neighbourhoods".</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Strongly object to Section 11 'Providing Appropriate Housing Types' and the extent to which this is genuinely supplementing development plan provisions, rather than seeking to inappropriately extend them by the 'back door' – an objective which should be pursued through due process by amending the Local Plan and not by the use of SPD.</p>	<p>Comments noted. SPD has been redrafted and contains a new Development Guidance section.</p>	<p>Y</p>

The Objector contends that the majority of the Eastside, certainly in the north, is a mixed use extension of the City Centre and cannot be construed as a discrete and coherent residential 'community'. Since the City Centre, including the Eastside are generally considered to be appropriate locations for student accommodation including PBSA, in particular, the Objector is concerned that the SPD is attempting now to characterise it as a community wherein housing provision needs to be 'balanced' (Policy HO6 of the Local Plan Part 2). The Eastside a good location for new PBSA precisely because it is not an established residential community (wherein existing non-student housing has been or is being displaced by student accommodation, as well as its proximity to and continuity with the City Centre and proximity to Nottingham Trent University. There is nothing wrong, therefore, for the Eastside containing a high and increasing proportion of PBSA. Indeed, by progressively reducing the locations in the City where PBSA is acceptable, the Council will choke off the supply of accommodation necessary to support the growth of both Universities and the legitimate objective of decanting students out of HMOs in established residential areas, in order to restore these latter properties to family accommodation

Comments noted. SPD has been redrafted and contains a new Development Guidance section.

Y

<p>With respect to the Subsection 'Building Heights and Massing', the Objector considers the assessment to poorly evidenced and justified, selective and arbitrary. It is not clear, for example, why a 12-storey building is considered to be acceptable on the former Staples Site (Paragraph 11.39) but not on other sites in the vicinity (for example the street block in which the Objector's property is located, or the adjoining street block (Paragraph 11.38). In cities elsewhere in the UK, the benefits of taller building 'clusters' are well-recognised, but here the approach to the Eastside seems to be ad hoc and represents an unevidenced and disconnected approach to townscape. The Councils highly conservative approach to permitting taller buildings in and around the City Centre, as reflected in this draft SPD is neither justified by the existing character of the City Centre, nor does it constitute a sustainable approach to development as it neglects the opportunity to make full and effective use of highly accessible urban land and is thus at odds with national policy as set out particularly in Chapter 11 of the NPPF. The SPD offers no good evidence – in terms of, for example, heritage, safeguarding and improving the environment, or ensuring safe and healthy living conditions, why it eschews taller building in this area, resistance to which seems to be based on an irrational institutional predisposition against what are modest heights compared to what is being positively encouraged in other regional cities. This seriously undermines the Council's pretension to be considered to be in the first rank of those cities.</p>	<p>The subsection 'Building Heights and Massing' shows indicative heights and massing which the Council views appropriate for this location, taking into account the local context, site analysis including 'street enclosure ratios' on page 41. The City Centre 3D model was also used to analyse potential building heights/massing and potential impact on key views and the setting of historic buildings of interest. In this regard, the SPD illustrates massing that represents an efficient and effective use of the land within the SPD area, consistent with Chapter 11 of the NPPF, having regard to the constraints noted above. Paragraphs 11.36 - 11.41 to be removed.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The Objector considers the draft SPD to be seriously flawed and unsound. To apply the assessment criteria of development plans, the SPD has not been 'positively prepared', is not, at present, 'justified', is not effective and nor is it 'consistent with National Policy'. The Objector considers that its provisions seek to go beyond the proper scope of SPD and to be attempting to be making new policy which should only properly be done with new/amended development plan documents and through the recognised routes for scrutiny and approval thereof.</p>	<p>Comments noted. SPD has been redrafted and contains a new Development Guidance section.</p>	<p>Y</p>

<p>Royal mail building retrofitted and incorporated into the new buildings, the buildings iconic facade should be maintained and would create a quirky and characterful building, inside and out. A new co-working space or a new restaurant called 'The Delivery Office' could activate the space.</p>	<p>The existing building is not listed or within the Sneinton Market Conservation Area. The building itself does not lend itself for conversion or to be incorporated into a new building. However, if the result of an assessment of the building suggested it is of heritage value, the design team should explore whether it can be feasibly incorporated into any development and if not it should be adequately recorded and that record should be deposited in Nottingham's Historic Environment Record.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Edible planting, fruit trees lining the streets, edible defensible planting, could the area be called 'Edible Eastside'? This could be an opportunity to really push the site as innovative edible edge of the city, getting the new residents together by picking and cooking food together?</p>	<p>Reference to be added to Paragraphs 11.30 and 11.33 for GI and new street trees and including areas for food growing. Further advice and information is also available to applicants in the DQF's 'Well Being Design Guide'.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Would a 3/4 storey row of terraces houses match the existing housing along Brook St more appropriately?</p>	<p>Developing 3/4 storey housing along Brook Street would be adversely impacted by overlooking and overshadowing by any new apartments fronting onto Lower Parliament Street due to the depth of the sites.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Would like to see a lido. It would attract people to the area.</p>	<p>This would rely on land being available and a private developer bringing forward a proposal for a lido. The SPD would not prevent a lido from coming forward for development in the future.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Welcomes the draft Eastside SPD, in particular its recognition that there are serious difficulties in the area in respect to active travel, especially to and from Sneinton and St Ann's into the city centre.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Changes to improve permeability set out in the Proposed Transport Infrastructure Plan (page 45) should be identified as priorities in Section 12. Improvements should be consistent with LTN1/20.</p>	<p>This is referenced in paragraph 12.4.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The SPD should further emphasise the need to make the A60 less hostile to cyclists, including cycling commuters. We advise a 20 mile per hour speed limit for this and associated roads, in particular Glasshouse Street.</p>	<p>This is referenced on page 44 and 45.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Support the proposal to pedestrianise Union Road, but the SPD must not fail to consider cyclists, and should design infrastructure consistent with current guidance (Local Transport Note 1/20, Gov.UK). There is a compelling need for improved walking access across the main road at the principal junctions.</p>	<p>Support noted. This is referenced on page 44 and 45.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The cycle cage on St Ann's Street is generally full and obviously not big enough for existing let alone future traffic. Section 106 agreements should address this lack of capacity.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, there are no plans to expand the cycle cage. Funding such as S106 can provide capital funding to install but the City Council cannot take on revenue costs at the moment such as CCTV and maintenance which are associated with the hubs. Officers will continue to monitor the St Ann's hub due to it being used for bike storage by nearby residents rather than as a parking facility for people coming into the city centre.</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>The impact of PBSA development discussed in section 11 needs to include the fact that such development will be lightly used for large parts of the year, with consequences for the safety of any pedestrian routes which are associated with such development. We support the need for active frontages at ground floor level so that natural surveillance is provided year round.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Text added into the SPD to refer to Local Plan Part 2 policy DE1 (c) to ensure that active street frontages will be encouraged to increase natural surveillance along streets.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>In para 11.30 it would be better if 'where possible' was deleted from 'Walking routes should, where possible, be lined with active ground floor frontages'.</p>	<p>Delete "where possible" from paragraph 11.30.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>In the sentence beginning 'Blocks fronting..'should provide' should be replaced by 'must provide'.</p>	<p>Language consistent with SPD remit.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>In para 11.31/32 'should seek to incorporate pedestrian routes' seems weak. It is not clear what 'the back of the footpath line' means. These aspects should be clarified and strengthened.</p>	<p>Delete "seek to" from paragraph 11.31.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>In para 11.34, electric charging points for e-bikes should be added.</p>	<p>Agree, document amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>The draft SPD is vague about the specifics of green infrastructure (GI) and no new potential sites for GI are identified. Nottingham LAF considers that Union Road should be 'greened' rather than converted to hard standing</p> <p>We have also recommended new public open space at the former Victoria Works development site. New street tree planting should be a routine element of development control decision making, using specifications for larger planting stock and sustainably engineered pit design.</p>	<p>Reference to be added to Paragraph 11.33 for "and to greened by providing new GI".</p> <p>It is envisaged that S106 contributions will be sought from the development of the Victoria Works site to enhance the existing open space and public realm between Glasshouse Street and St Ann's Street. Reference to "street tree planting" has been included within paragraphs 9.12, 9.13, 9.14 and 9.15.</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Y</p>