

Nottingham City

land and planning policies

Development Plan Document



**Report of Consultation
for the Issues and Option and
Additional Sites Consultations
September 2013**

Contents Page

| | |
|---|------------|
| INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| APPENDIX 1 – COMMENTS RECEIVED AT THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE ON DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES | 7 |
| CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION | 8 |
| CHAPTER 2: WHAT IS THE LAPP DPD? | 10 |
| CHAPTER 3 – STRONG AND DIVERSE ECONOMY | 15 |
| CHAPTER 4: MIXED AND BALANCED COMMUNITIES | 29 |
| CHAPTER 5: REJUVENATING NEIGHBOURHOODS | 62 |
| CHAPTER 6: ATTRACTIVE AND SAFE NEIGHBOURHOODS | 70 |
| CHAPTER 7: HEALTHY NEIGHBOURHOODS AND A THRIVING NATURAL ENVIRONMENT | 77 |
| CHAPTER 8: COMBATING CLIMATE CHANGE LOCALLY | 91 |
| CHAPTER 9: WELL CONNECTED NEIGHBOURHOODS | 96 |
| CHAPTER 10: INFRASTRUCTURE | 101 |
| APPENDIX 2 – COMMENTS RECEIVED AT THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE ON DEVELOPMENT SITES | 102 |
| DS1 BELGRAVE ROAD / LINNINGTON ROAD | 103 |
| DS2 BESTWOOD DAY CENTRE | 104 |
| DS3 BESTWOOD SIDINGS | 105 |
| DS4 BLENHEIM LANE SITE | 106 |
| DS5 HENRY MELLISH MAIN SCHOOL SITE | 107 |
| DS6 LINBY STREET/FILEY STREET | 108 |
| DS7 STANTON TIP | 109 |
| DS8 HUCKNALL ROAD/SOUTHGLADE ROAD (SOUTHGLADE FOOD PARK) | 110 |
| DS9 BAR LANE INDUSTRIAL PARK | 111 |
| DS10 BASFORD GASWORKS | 112 |
| DS11 BASFORD GATEWAY | 114 |
| DS12 CHURCH VIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE | 115 |
| DS13 JOHNSONS DYEWORKS | 117 |
| DS14 WESTERN BOULEVARD | 121 |
| DS15 WESTERN SECTION OF FORMER DUNN LINE COACH STATION | 122 |
| DS16 CHRONOS RICHARDSON | 123 |
| DS17 FORMER EASTGLADE PRIMARY AND NURSERY SCHOOL | 124 |
| DS18 FORMER PADSTOW SCHOOL | 125 |
| DS19 FORMER PADSTOW SCHOOL DETACHED PLAYING FIELD (BECKHAMPTON ROAD) | 127 |
| DS20 FORMER PADSTOW SCHOOL DETACHED PLAYING FIELD (RIDGEWAY) | 129 |
| DS21 HAYWOOD DETACHED PLAYING FIELD | 131 |
| DS22 CHINGFORD ROAD PLAYING FIELD | 133 |
| DS23 MELBURY SCHOOL PLAYING FIELD | 134 |
| DS24 NOTTINGHAM BUSINESS PARK NORTH | 135 |
| DS25 NOTTINGHAM BUSINESS PARK SOUTH - DEVELOPER OPTION | 136 |
| DS26 NOTTINGHAM BUSINESS PARK SOUTH - EXISTING ALLOCATION | 137 |
| DS27 THE DENEWOOD CENTRE | 138 |
| DS28 BOBBERS MILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE | 139 |
| DS29 CHALFONT DRIVE | 140 |
| DS30 SOUTH OF FORMER CO-OP DAIRY | 141 |
| DS31 SPEEDO SITE | 142 |
| DS32 ELLIS AND EVERARD, HADYN ROAD | 142 |
| DS33 LORTAS ROAD | 144 |
| DS34 FOREST MILL | 145 |
| DS35 PEOPLE'S COLLEGE | 146 |
| DS36 RADFORD MILL | 148 |
| DS37 SANDFIELD CENTRE | 149 |
| DS38 HINE HALL | 151 |
| DS39 SPRINGFIELD, ALEXANDRA PARK | 152 |
| DS40 FORMER HAYWOOD SCHOOL SITE | 153 |
| DS41 SHERWOOD LIBRARY | 154 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| DS42 | EASTSIDE - BUS DEPOTS | 155 |
| DS43 | EASTSIDE - PENNYFOOT STREET..... | 157 |
| DS44 | WATERSIDE - BRITISH WATERWAYS OWNED PART OF FREETH STREET SITE | 158 |
| DS45 | WATERSIDE – EASTPOINT | 160 |
| DS46 | WATERSIDE - FREETH STREET..... | 161 |
| DS47 | WATERSIDE - PARK YACHT CLUB | 163 |
| DS48 | WATERSIDE - TRENT LANE BASIN | 165 |
| DS49 | CASTLE COLLEGE..... | 167 |
| DS50 | EASTSIDE - SNEINTON MARKET | 168 |
| DS51 | FORMER ALBANY WORKS AND FORMER CO-OP SITE | 170 |
| DS52 | ROBIN HOOD CHASE..... | 171 |
| DS53 | VICTORIA CENTRE EXPANSION | 172 |
| DS54 | RADFORD BRIDGE ALLOTMENTS (OPTION 1) | 173 |
| DS55 | RADFORD BRIDGE ALLOTMENTS (OPTION 2) | 191 |
| DS56 | WOODYARD LANE | 212 |
| DS57 | BROADMARSH SHOPPING CENTRE..... | 231 |
| DS58 | CANAL STREET NORTH | 232 |
| DS59 | EASTSIDE - ISLAND SITE | 233 |
| DS60 | NG2 SOUTH..... | 234 |
| DS61 | NG2 WEST | 235 |
| DS62 | RIVERSIDE WAY | 237 |
| DS63 | SOUTHSIDE - ARKWRIGHT STREET EAST | 238 |
| DS64 | SOUTHSIDE - MIDLAND RAILWAY STATION/THE HUB..... | 240 |
| DS65 | SOUTHSIDE - SHERIFFS WAY/ARKWRIGHT STREET | 242 |
| DS66 | SOUTHSIDE - SITE OF FORMER HICKING PENTECOST & COMPANY | 243 |
| DS67 | SOUTHSIDE – SOUTHPOINT..... | 245 |
| DS68 | SOUTHSIDE - SOVEREIGN HOUSE | 247 |
| DS69 | SOUTHSIDE - WATERWAY STREET..... | 247 |
| DS70 | WATERSIDE - BRITISH WATERWAYS OWNED PART OF MEADOW LANE SITE..... | 249 |
| DS71 | WATERSIDE - EASTCROFT DEPOT..... | 250 |
| DS72 | WATERSIDE - FORMER HARTWELLS | 252 |
| DS73 | WATERSIDE - IREMONGER ROAD | 254 |
| DS74 | WATERSIDE - MEADOW LANE..... | 255 |
| DS75 | WATERSIDE - SOUTH OF EASTCROFT DEPOT | 257 |
| DS76 | BOOTS | 258 |
| DS77 | BULL CLOSE ROAD..... | 260 |
| DS78 | MEDI PARK | 261 |
| DS79 | NOTTINGHAM SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY PARK PHASE TWO | 262 |
| DS80 | WESTERN CLUB..... | 263 |
| DS81 | FARNBOROUGH SCHOOL | 265 |
| DS82 | CLIFTON WEST | 266 |
| DS83 | FAIRHAM COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL | 267 |
| DS84 | FAIRHAM HOUSE | 268 |
| | ADDITIONAL SITES..... | 270 |

**APPENDIX 3 – COMMENTS RECEIVED AT ADDITIONAL SITES CONSULTATION STAGE
ON DEVELOPMENT SITES..... 272**

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| DS85 | FORMER HENRY MELLISH SCHOOL PLAYING FIELD - "PICCADILLY" | 273 |
| DS86 | FORMER COACH DEPOT (ALTERNATIVE BOUNDARY)..... | 274 |
| DS87 | BROXTOWE COUNTRY PARK..... | 275 |
| DS88 | NEW ASPLEY GARDENS (OPTION 1)..... | 278 |
| DS89 | NEW ASPLEY GARDENS (OPTION 2)..... | 280 |
| DS90 | BEECHDALE BATHS AND AMBULANCE SERVICE HQ | 283 |
| DS91 | LAND ADJACENT TO BOBBERS MILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE | 285 |
| DS92 | FORMER PZ CUSSONS FACTORY | 287 |
| DS93 | SEVERN TRENT WATER DEPOT | 288 |
| DS94 | SALISBURY STREET..... | 289 |
| DS95 | GUILDHALL | 291 |
| DS96 | EXPANSION TO JUBILEE CAMPUS..... | 294 |
| DS97 | ELECTRIC AVENUE - OPTION 1 | 297 |

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----|
| DS98 | ELECTRIC AVENUE - OPTION 2 | 298 |
| DS99 | NG2 SOUTH (ALTERNATIVE USES) | 300 |
| DS100 | STATION STREET/CARRINGTON STREET | 301 |
| DS101 | WATERSIDE - CATTLE MARKET | 303 |
| DS102 | FORMER DUNKIRK FIRE STATION | 304 |
| C59 | SAINSBURY’S CASTLE MARINA | 306 |
| C60 | SAINSBURY’S PERRY ROAD | 307 |

Introduction

This report has been prepared to highlight the range of consultation measures carried out in accordance with the City Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

It also sets out in Appendix 1, a summary of the comments received during the 'Issues & Options' and the 'Additional Sites' consultations as well as the Council's response to these comments.

Consultation on the Issues and Options document took place over an 8 week period from 26 September 2011 to 21 November.

Additional sites were put forward through the Issues and Options Consultation. These sites were then subject to further consultation over an 8 week period from 5 March 2012 to 30 April 2012.

The comments received were taken into account when preparing the 'Preferred Option' version of the LAPP which will be subject to further consultation. A further 'Report of Consultation' will be produced following consultation on the 'Preferred Option' document. References to 'Preferred Option' throughout this report relate to the Preferred Option version of the LAPP and not any other document.

'Issues and Options' and 'Additional Sites' Consultations

Direct mailings:

- Direct mailings were sent, in the form of neighbour notification letters, to those properties surrounding the proposed development sites. The method used for selecting these properties was consistent with that used for consulting on a planning application.
- Direct mailings in the form of a letter or an e-mail were sent to all contacts on our Local Development Framework (LDF) consultation database. This included statutory consultees, adjacent authorities, interest/environmental groups and the public.
- An item on the consultation was included in the electronic LDF newsletter and sent to approximately 700 email contacts from the LDF database on 8/7/11 (Issues and Options) and 13/3/12 (Additional Sites).

Awareness raising:

External:

- A covering letter, a hard copy of the document, leaflets, and response forms were made available in all the City libraries, as well as the Information Point at Central Library and the City's Joint Service Centres (JSCs). The leaflet also advertised the community drop-in sessions.
- Item in the One Nottingham e-bulletin.
- Item in the Nottingham NCVS e-bulletin.
- Information circulated via other colleagues/organisations email circulation lists – e.g. Nottingham Development Enterprise, Invest in

Nottingham newsletter (30/9/11), Nottingham Regeneration Ltd and the City Council's Neighbourhood Management team.

- Item on the City Council's Corporate Facebook page.

Internal:

- Colleague drop-in session - 30/9/11.
- Consultation advertised on TV screens in Loxley House.

Local Press:

- Press release published and various articles published in the Nottingham Evening Post.

Council Publications:

- Article published in the Arrow, a City Council publication delivered to every residential address in the City.

Internet:

- Article featured on the City Council's Intranet and website. Electronic response forms available on line (SNAP questionnaire).

Loxley House reception:

- Pop-up banner, leaflets and a copy of document in reception for the duration of the consultation period.

Stakeholder engagement:

- Stakeholder and Partner workshop, Nottingham Conference Centre – 17/11/12

Events and meetings:

- Where appropriate, a pop-up banner and copies of the consultation leaflet were taken to all events and meetings.
- Various meetings were attended by members of the team to raise awareness of the consultation. In some cases a report was presented at the meeting where attendance was not possible. Some of these meetings were internal City Council meetings, others were attended by a mixture of both internal and external colleagues, and others were meetings in the community. These were as follows;
 - Community drop-in sessions at Clifton Cornerstone, Mary Potter and Central Library and Bulwell Library – October 2011.
 - Basford Community Forum meeting – 12/10/11 (external)
 - Open and Green Spaces Champions Group meeting (internal/external) - 14/06/11
 - City Council Area Committee meetings x 10 (internal/external) – Sept 2011
 - Development Control Committee (internal/external) - 19/10/11
 - Corporate Leadership Team meeting (internal) – Sept 2011
 - Various One Nottingham meetings (internal/external) - Green Theme Partnership (internal/external) - 28/9/11, and reports presented at the Neighbourhood Nottingham Working Group 8/12/11.

- Community Equality Forum meeting (internal/external) - 13/9/11
- Labour Group Councillors Briefing (internal) - 25/7/11, in advance of consultation period.
- Open Space Forum meeting (internal/external) - 10/10/11
- Local Access Forum meeting (internal/external) - 28/10/11
- Issues and Options Councillor themed workshops (internal x 4) 28/2/12 and 29/2/12
- Several colleague themed (policies and sites) drop-in sessions (internal)
- Ward forums/focus Groups (x 3), led by Neighbourhood Management – Basford, Mapperley, Radford and Park Ward – November 2011
- One Nottingham Lunchtime Learning session (internal/external) - 31/10/11
- Councillor drop-in sessions focussing on Additional Sites (internal) – March 2012

**Appendix 1 – Comments received at the Issues and Options Consultation
Stage on Development Management Policies**

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Q 1.1: Are there any issues emerging through the published draft National Planning Policy Framework and provisions of the Localism Bill that we should consider?

- Need to identify locally specific policies relating to the historic environment that are not covered in other documents.
- Biodiversity opportunity mapping essential to ensure Community Infrastructure Levy for Green Infrastructure is spent effectively.
- Concern about 'presumption in favour of development' and that the City Council is best placed to make planning decisions in the best interests of Nottingham's residents.
- Production of the LAPP Issues and Options document is premature as the Preferred Option for the Joint Core Strategy has not been consulted on. LAPP preparation should be suspended pending the adoption of amendments to the Localism Bill, government's response to the consultation on the National Policy Framework and the Examination of the Aligned Core Strategy.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option document contains specific policies covering the significant aspects of Nottingham's historic environment. As well as covering nationally recognised assets, policies in the Preferred Option document will relate to buildings, archaeological sites, monuments and public spaces of local and regional significance.
- The Preferred Option document takes on board guidance contained within the adopted National Planning Policy Framework and amendments to the Localism Bill. It has been prepared alongside the Aligned Core Strategy. The City Council feels that the draft policy wording in the Land and Planning Policies Preferred Option document is in conformity with the policies in the Aligned Core Strategy. It is not valid, within the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, to delay preparation of the Development Plan.
- The Preferred Option includes policies relating to biodiversity and non-statutory sites. There is a Green Infrastructure policy in the Core Strategy. Both the Core Strategy policies and the LAPP policies will be taken into account when planning decisions are made in the future.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge - English Heritage (East Midlands)
Ms Jones Jenkins - Notts Wildlife Trust
Mrs Silveste - Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Ms Freeman - The Theatres Trust
Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP
Ms Armstrong
John Lewis Partnership
Mr Day - Nottingham City Council

Mr Giles
Ms Atkin - Nottingham City Council

Q 1.2: Do you have any general comments on this section?

- General approach is supported.
- LAPP's content should be as specific as possible in order to provide clarity.
- Relationship with Neighbourhood Plans needs to be made clearer. Paragraph 1.4 is ambiguous as it implies that Neighbourhood Plans will provide another opportunity for residents to influence site allocations.
- Definition of terms including 'community', 'sustainable', 'affordable', 'regeneration objectives', 'significant concentrations of HMOs' required.
- With regards paragraph 1.5 (relating to CIL), English Heritage would welcome early involvement in discussions relating to the Boots Campus, as the site contains a number of listed buildings.
- Natural England support the approach which recognises the importance of getting a plan in place which will provide a framework for informing local development and the consideration of Neighbourhood Plans.
- Planning decisions are the responsibility of locally elected and accountable planning authorities and any measures that can be put in place to strengthen the ability of the Council to make decisions based on local priorities is supported.
- Production of the LAPP DPD should be postponed until the direction of the new national policy framework is understood and the Council has progressed its Core Strategy.
- Public should be contacted / made aware of what is happening in their local area, which is part of what the Localism Bill is attempting to achieve.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Policy wording within the Preferred Option version of the LAPP is more specific. The LAPP will also provide further information on any supplementary planning documents that are relevant.
- Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the LAPP. The wording in paragraph 1.4 of the Issues and Options version of the LAPP will not be carried forward into the Preferred Option version.
- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP will include a glossary that explains terms referred to within the policies.

List of respondees:

Ms Newman- Natural England - Nottinghamshire and Lowland Derbyshire
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Ms Armstrong

Chapter 2: What is the LAPP DPD?

Q 2.1: Do you have any comments on the purpose of the LAPP DPD?

- General support for the purpose of the LAPP.
- Concerns about the lack of commitment and ambition for biodiversity, non-statutory and Green Infrastructure Policies.
- Need a definition of the term 'sustainable'.
- The LAPP should make more reference to theatres.
- The purpose of the LAPP is not to deliver sustainable development.
- Important to ensure that the Town Centre Boundary is not drawn too widely.
- City Council should ensure that all objectives and priorities have equal weighting.
- More clarity over the role of Neighbourhood Plans is required. Figure 2.1 should show Neighbourhood plans.
- City Council should take a more pro-active stance as a planning authority to align its regeneration aspirations.
- LAPP will struggle to deliver if transport and waste are not under consideration. There needs to be cohesion between the three processes in order to be successful.
- What will happen to sites below 0.5ha?

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option includes policies relating to biodiversity and non-statutory sites. There is a Green Infrastructure policy in the Core Strategy. Both the Core Strategy policies and the LAPP policies will be taken into account when planning decisions are made in the future. The footer on each page of the LAPP states that all of the LAPP policies should be read in conjunction with the emerging Core Strategy.
- A definition of 'sustainable' has been included in the Glossary of the Preferred Option version of the LAPP.
- The LAPP includes a policy on the Royal Quarter which aims to enhance and promote the area around the Theatre Royal.
- LAPP has been amended so that it is clear that the document itself does not deliver sustainable development but provides detailed guidance in terms of development management policies and site allocations for Nottingham City.
- The LAPP contains new retail planning boundaries for consultation.
- No policy in the LAPP will be applied in isolation. The footer of every page will state this.
- Figure 2.1 has been amended to show Neighbourhood Plans.

- A detailed site appraisal has been undertaken for each of the LAPP sites with regeneration aspirations incorporated as appropriate.
- There are policies on both waste and transport in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP. Waste and transport have also been taken into consideration in the detailed site appraisals undertaken for each of the sites.
- 0.5ha is the threshold for sites for inclusion within the LAPP. It does not mean that sites below this threshold are not suitable for any development. Sites that are suitable for housing that are below 0.5ha are contained within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

List of respondees:

Ms Newman - Natural England - Nottinghamshire and Lowland Derbyshire
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge - English Heritage (East Midlands)
Ms Jones Jenkins - Notts Wildlife Trust
Mr Walters- Highways Agency
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Ms Freeman - The Theatres Trust
Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Ms Armstrong
John Lewis Partnership
Nottingham City Homes
Mr Day - Nottingham City Council
Mr Giles
Ms Atkin - Nottingham City Council
Mr Neville

Q 2.2: Do you agree that the correct themes have been identified for the LAPP DPD?

- General support for the Themes but explicit reference should be made to the historic environment.
- Concern that many of the LAPP sites are partially or wholly designated as LNRs or SINCs.
- Timely and viable infrastructure will be key to developing well connected neighbourhoods.
- Need to ensure that housing objectives include significant efforts to make sure that families are encouraged to come and stay in neighbourhoods.
- 'Healthy neighbourhoods and a thriving natural environment' should be retitled.
- Accessible homes and also Lifetime Homes are important themes that need to be considered.
- Inclusion and Equality issues need to be considered and included at all stages of the LAPP and planning process.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The themes in the Preferred Option have been amended so that they are more in line with the emerging Core Strategy and reflect more topic areas including a specific section on the Historic Environment.
- Not all of the sites set out in the Issues and Option version of the LAPP have been carried forward to the Preferred Option. All of the sites have undergone a detailed site analysis, and a Sustainability Appraisal, in which factors such as biodiversity have been assessed to inform their inclusion. The Development Principles relating to each of the sites carried forward details any constraints or important features that need to be taken into account in site development .
- Infrastructure has been considered in detail through the site appraisal process. Further work on viability will be undertaken before the publication version of the LAPP.
- The Preferred Option includes specific policies relating to family housing.
- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP now includes the following section entitled: 'Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles'.
- The Preferred Option contains policies on Specialist Housing and also Residential Design. The Core Strategy also includes requirements for these.
- An Equality Impact Assessment will be carried out prior to the publication of the LAPP.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
Mr Walters- Highways Agency
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mrs Rose
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ms Armstrong
John Lewis Partnership
Ms Mee
Mr Day- Nottingham City Council
Mr Giles
Ms Mossman & Ms Silver- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement

Q 2.3: Do you have any comments on the relationship between the LAPP DPD, the SCS and Core Strategy?

- Most respondents indicated that they did not have any comments.
- One resposdee stated that the LAPP is premature and out of sequence as the Preferred Option of the Core Strategy was not published at the time of the consultation on the Issues and Options version of the LAPP.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Core Strategy has been submitted to the government for Independent Examination in advance of consultation on the Preferred Option of the LAPP.

List of respondees:

Ms Newman - Natural England - Nottinghamshire and Lowland Derbyshire
Mr Walters - Highways Agency
Dr & Mrs Fletcher - Nottingham Action Group
Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Mr Day - Nottingham City Council
Mr Giles
Ms Mossman & Ms Silver- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement

Q 2.4: Do you have any comments on this section?

- Old and new allocations will need to be assessed in accordance with current planning guidance relating to the historic environment.
- Reference is needed to the importance of the historic environment and discussion of the particular significance of Nottingham is required.
- Greenfield sites are especially precious in the City and development of them should be avoided at considerable effort.
- Support for the evolution of the LAPP and further opportunity to comment at the Preferred Option stage is welcomed.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Detailed site appraisals have been carried out for each site and the impact on the historic environment has been assessed for each site.
- The Preferred Option contains a section outlining the importance of the historic environment.
- The Open Space Network in the City has been revised and re-mapped for the Preferred Option. It seeks to define and protect green space in the City. The Open Space Network includes parks, nature reserves, public and private playing fields, golf courses, allotments, cemeteries, play spaces, woodland, banks and towpaths or rivers and canals and other vegetated paths and track ways, squares and other incidental spaces.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Sylvester – Nottingham Civic Society/ Thorneywood Residents Association

Mr Leslie MP
Mr Smith
John Lewis Partnership
Mr Giles

Chapter 3 – Strong and Diverse Economy

Issue 3a: City Centre

Q 3.1: Do you have any comments of the potential sites for retail and other town centre uses, as set out in the schedule in Appendix 1 and the maps in Appendix 2?

- No comments received for this question.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Not applicable

List of respondees:

No comments received for this question.

Q 3.2: While the benefits to the City Centre of Broadmarsh and Victoria Centre expansions would be significant, how might planning policies respond to the potential for some cumulative short-term negative impacts on some parts of the City Centre?

- Assumptions that expanding Broadmarsh and Victoria Centre bring significant benefits and only short term negative impacts to the city centre are contested, Broadmarsh redevelopment proposals represent substantial and long term harm to the historic environment, including loss of heritage assets and negative impact on the setting of many listed buildings and conservation areas.
- The proposed redevelopment of the Victoria Centre misses an opportunity to regenerate this part of the city centre in a more sustainable and sensitive way
- Nottingham city centre is of high significance in terms of historic environment and there should be a planning policy approach to preserve and enhance this, alongside demands for economic and commercial vitality. Heritage assets should be an essential part to inform and shape future development.
- Considerable concern regarding city centre areas likely to be affected e.g. Old Market Square, Wheelergate, Clumber St, Pelham St, Bridlesmith Gate, Friar Lane, Angel Row, Market St, suggests brightening up empty shop windows rather than boarding up and refers to work undertaken in Stockport and Cardiff.
- Concerned about possible long-term (not just short term) effects on the city centre i.e. around the market square of intensified development at the north and south poles of the city centre.
- Further development of Broadmarsh is uncertain following its recent sale, a contraction of the potential area of retail development as

extension to the existing centre would be appropriate. A more deliverable and targeted area for mixed use regeneration around the existing centre should be identified.

- Some short term negative impacts inevitably result on other areas of the city centre as sites are redeveloped but these are part of the economic cycle and not a sufficient concern to warrant a policy in the LAPP.
- Victoria Centre proposal should be phased and should not impact on the Broadmarsh delivery.
- Formally designate an Entertainment Quarter around the Royal Centre and Cornerhouse, provide safe walking routes from the main public transport hubs to this area.
- In line with PPS4, refuse proposals if their impact is significantly adverse.
- Flow of traffic and inner city parking must be considered ahead of any development.
- Expansion of the Victoria Centre supported in line for the trend for large malls, attracting new quality shops into the city.
- Requirement for a shopping mall (Broadmarsh) in this location is questioned which has been in decline for many years, suggests relocating shops throughout the town, demolishing the centre and replacing this with a green urban space which would encourage restaurants, cafes and bars.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- City Centre retail designations and corresponding development management policies incorporated to steer retail development to primary shopping area, reinforce primary shopping frontages within the retail core, to support the independent sector and to encourage a balanced and diverse retail provision, including within traditional shopping streets as well as 'centre based' units.
- Broadmarsh and Victoria Centre included as Preferred Option allocations and accompanied by site specific development principles providing broad framework for uses and form of development, and consideration of transport matters.
- Development management policy included in Preferred Option in relation to major retail development within the City Centre (including the phasing of Broadmarsh and Victoria Centre developments).
- Development Management Policies included in the Preferred Option in respect of design specifically within the City Centre Primary Shopping Area, as well as general design, public realm and historic environment policies.
- Preferred Option policies included in respect of transport and parking.
- Preferred Option designations and policies included for distinct Quarters within the City Centre, including 'Royal Quarter' where enhanced entertainment provision encouraged.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mrs Silvester Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Waumsley Freeth Cartwright LLP
Ropemaker Nottingham Limited
John Lewis Partnership
Ms Cross
Mr Giles

Q 3.3: Should, and could, the response to short-term cumulative negative impacts of the Broadmarsh and Victoria Centre expansions go beyond ensuring physical links and environmental improvements? If so, how?

- Further development of Broadmarsh is uncertain following its recent sale, a contraction of the potential area of retail development as extension to the existing centre would be appropriate. A more deliverable and targeted area for mixed use regeneration around the existing centre should be identified.
- Environmental improvements welcomed, as this may benefit the historic environment.
- Creation of new links that do not respect the city centre's historic form and layout should be avoided.
- High quality, possibly specialist and small-scale retail, food and other attractive outlets in areas vacated by large retailers should be encouraged.
- Victoria Centre proposal should be phased and should not impact on the Broadmarsh delivery.
- Formally designate an Entertainment Quarter around the Royal Centre and Cornerhouse for example, provide safe walking routes from the main public transport hubs to this area.
- In line with PPS4, refuse proposal if impact is significantly adverse.
- Positive promotion of individual streets - try to avoid too many pound shops and charity shops, encourage independent traders and possibly satellite stores (from large retailers) in the mode of Tesco and Sainsbury.
- Emphasise positive appeal of the city, not just retail but also cultural i.e. cultural corridors between Broadway Cinema, Royal Centre, Cornerhouse, Playhouse, Albert Hall and Nottingham Contemporary for example.
- Review transport provision - the city is still mainly split in two

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- City Centre retail designations and corresponding development management policies incorporated to reinforce primary shopping frontages

within the retail core, to support the independent sector and to encourage a balanced and diverse retail provision, including within traditional shopping streets as well as 'centre based' units.

- Broadmarsh and Victoria Centre included as Preferred Option allocations and accompanied by site specific development principles providing broad framework for uses and form of development, and consideration of transport matters.
- Development management policy included in Preferred Option in relation to major retail development within the City Centre (including the phasing of Broadmarsh and Victoria Centre developments).
- Development Management Policies included in the Preferred Option in respect of design specifically within the City Centre Primary Shopping Area, as well as general design, public realm and historic environment policies.
- Preferred Option policies included in respect of transport and parking.
- Preferred Option designations and policies included for distinct Quarters within the City Centre, including 'Royal Quarter' where enhanced entertainment provision encouraged.
- Preferred Option policies for primary shopping area and wider City Centre, including Quarters policies, support enhancement of cultural and tourism offer, development that reinforces local identity and improvements to key tourism routes.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mrs Silvester Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Waumsley Freeth Cartwright LLP
Ropemaker Nottingham Limited
John Lewis Partnership
Mr Neville

Q 3.4: What other types of issues should be considered in relation to the potential impacts of the expansion of the Broadmarsh and Victoria Centre?

- Further development of Broadmarsh is uncertain following its recent sale, a contraction of the potential area of retail development as extension to the existing centre would be appropriate. A more deliverable and targeted area for mixed use regeneration around the existing centre should be identified.
- Better solutions could be delivered for both centres.
- Impact on leisure facilities queried and whether a cinema is needed in the Victoria Centre - this is considered to create an ugly upward extension with detrimental impact on the cityscape.
- Queries whether more restaurants are needed.
- Locally owned businesses should be encouraged (efforts should be

made to counteract the predominance of national and multi-national outlets).

- Improve links between north-south shopping axis, along with those somewhat isolated to the west of the city centre (and could become more so as retail moves away from the square).
- Pedestrian links/paths should be protected.
- Address the night-time economy - particularly the mix for leisure and retail in relation to alcohol consumption, related crime and disorder and hospital admissions.
- Victoria Centre proposal should be phased and should not impact on the Broadmarsh delivery.
- Formally designate an Entertainment Quarter around the Royal Centre and Cornerhouse for example, provide safe walking routes from the main public transport hubs to this area.
- The Victoria Centre should be considered as the principle centre.
- Rent affordability in the shopping centres.
- New development should add to its rich and unique character, retain a human scale, consider access and quality of place and fundamentally ensure it caters for all sections of the community. There is place for both schemes if carried out in a considered and sustainable way.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Broadmarsh and Victoria Centre land allocations incorporated within Preferred Option with accompanying development principles setting out details of phasing, mix of uses and other key principles including creation /enhancement of linkages, public realm improvements, preservation/ enhancement of historic assets.
- Development Management Policies included within Preferred Option to manage the balance and proportion of retail and leisure uses within the Primary Shopping Area and to address potential impacts of night time economy uses/food and drink uses.
- Preferred Option Development Management Policies included to support the provision of diverse range of retail units, including in respect of size, location and affordability and design.
- Area in the vicinity of the Royal Centre and Corner House included within Preferred Option as Royal Quarter designation where promotional policies support enhanced leisure and cultural facilities provision.
- Development Management policy included with Preferred Option setting out design principles for development specifically within the City Centre Primary Shopping Area, and also non area specific design and conservation policies. Policies also included in relation to creating / improving linkages.
- Preferred Option policy coverage includes promotion of independent retail offer and reinforcement of traditional shopping streets within the retail core.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ropemaker Nottingham Limited
John Lewis Partnership
Mr Giles
Mr Neville

Q 3.5: Do you agree with the proposed City Centre and primary shopping area boundaries, as set out in Appendix 3?

- The proposed boundary for the city centre primary shopping area is broadly agreed but it should be recognised that beyond this and the main centres of Bulwell, Clifton, Hyson Green, Sherwood and Alfreton Road that other centres are not really centres in the true sense of being a shopping destination, but merely a sporadic collection of local shopping provision. Those locations should not preclude additional appropriate neighbourhood retail development in them or elsewhere as appropriate and there is no particular need or sense in identifying them as shopping centres.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Existing City Centre boundary carried forward to Preferred Option.
- Broadly similar City Centre Primary Shopping Area designation incorporated within the Preferred Option with some boundary adjustments.

List of respondees:

Mr Leslie MP
Councillor Longford - Nottingham City Council
Mr Wilcox - NHS Nottingham City
Ropemaker Nottingham Limited

Issue 3b: Defining Centres**Q 3.6: Do you have any comments on the proposed town, district and local centre boundaries, as set out in Appendix 3?**

- The proposed boundary for the city centre primary shopping area is broadly agreed but it should be recognised that beyond this and the main centres of Bulwell, Clifton, Hyson Green, Sherwood and Alfreton Road that other centres are not really centres in the true sense of being a shopping destination, but merely a sporadic collection of local shopping provision. Those locations should not preclude additional

appropriate neighbourhood retail development in them or elsewhere as appropriate and there is no particular need or sense in identifying them as shopping centres.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Policies included within the Preferred Option to steer retail development to existing centres, but would not necessarily preclude small scale provision to meet local need elsewhere in appropriate cases.
- Local Centres and Centres of Neighbourhood Importance form part of the retail hierarchy set out in the emerging Core Strategy. Their designation as centres within the Preferred Option and inclusion of corresponding development management policies is consistent with the Core Strategy and considered to be reflective of their important roles in serving the needs of local communities.

List of respondees:

Asda Stores Limited
Mr Peter Conboy - Blueprint Limited Partnership

Q 3.7: Should we designate the CoNIs as set out in paragraph 3.12 and in accordance with the boundaries set out in Appendix 3?

- Considered to be acceptable.
- The proposed boundary for the city centre primary shopping area is broadly agreed but it should be recognised that beyond this and the main centres of Bulwell, Clifton, Hyson Green, Sherwood and Alfreton Road that other centres are not really centres in the true sense of being a shopping destination, but merely a sporadic collection of local shopping provision. Those locations should not preclude additional appropriate neighbourhood retail development in them or elsewhere as appropriate and there is no particular need or sense in identifying them as shopping centres.
- Supported - stresses the importance of these local centres in terms of services and employment opportunities they provide for many residents.
- Supports CONIs, the boundary should include the Albany Works site and redesignating Carlton Road as a Local Centre once a new food store is in place.
- 2 new CONIs should be included based around Sainsbury store sites.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Policies to be included within the Preferred Option to steer retail development to existing centres, but would not necessarily preclude small scale provision to meet local need elsewhere in appropriate cases.
- Local Centres and Centres of Neighbourhood Importance form part of the retail hierarchy set out in the emerging Core Strategy. Their designation as centres within the Preferred Option and corresponding development management policies, is consistent with the Core Strategy and considered to be reflective of their important roles in serving the needs of local communities.
- Albany Works and adjoining former Co-op Site to be included as a Preferred Option land allocation. All centres to be subject to monitoring and regular review, including Carlton Road that could in future be re-designated as a Local Centre following replacement food store provision.
- Derby Road Top / 164-172 Derby Road to be removed from Centre designation due to its small size and absence of characteristics warranting CONI designation. All other CONIs to be carried forward into preferred option with some boundary adjustments.
- Requests for additional CONI designations at Sainsbury Perry road and Sainsbury Castle Boulevard rejected as unjustified.

List of respondees:

Mr Leslie MP
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
Nottingham City Homes
Mr Neville
Asda Stores Limited

Q 3.8: Should we implement more stringent definitions or distances than PPS4 related to 'edge of centre' based on the type of centre, i.e. District, Local or CoNI as set out in paragraph 3.17?

- Queries why a large Tesco has been given permission in Beeston;
- This would be inappropriate and there is no basis for adopting different definitions to those contained in current guidance . Should reflect PPS4/national guidance;
- There is a danger that policy will too restrictive and stifle economic development opportunities;
- The BID is not a partnership between the City Council and local businesses. It is 100% funded by businesses, 100% led by businesses and is 100% committed to carry out projects to improve the trading conditions for those businesses it affects;
- The 300m PPS4 reference to what might be considered an "easy

walking distance” is a matter of fact in the individual circumstances (as to whether 300m is an easy walking distance or not) and providing for alternative specific distances is not appropriate. An easy walking distance will not change whether the centre be a District, Local or CONI.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Preferred Option does not deviate from national policy guidelines in relation to Edge of Centre and Out of Centre definitions.

List of respondees:

Mrs Randle
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Foster
John Lewis Partnership
Ms Oates- We Are Nottingham
Mr White-Wrenbridge
PZ Cussons

Q 3.9: Should we require impact assessments for all unplanned edge or out of centre retail development above 1,000 square metres? Would a different threshold be more appropriate?

- Queries why a large Tesco has been given permission in Beeston.
- Impact assessments are considered to be important.
- Lower threshold supported bearing in mind comments about the need to have local shopping for people without access to cars. Larger developments are likely to have a detrimental effect on smaller shops within the driving area, so disadvantaging people who rely on those smaller, nearer shops. Out of town shopping tends to have a negative impact on the local retailing sector and this causes problems for community cohesion, local employment and environment sensitivity.
- Impact assessments supported for large development - the strength of Nottingham city centre's retail offer has been developed through a relative lack of large scale retail developments outside the city. Out of town stores tend to have a negative impact on the local retailing sector, and it is right to closely examine every proposal for its environmental impacts.
- Inappropriate and there is no basis for adopting different definitions of edge of centre to those contained in the current guidance of PPS4.
- All retail developments of significance should require Impact Assessment but only in relation to impact on the major centres and not on small groups of neighbourhood shops where they exist.

- The assessment should score access by walking and cycling equally with public transport above car access due to health benefits.
- Lower thresholds need to be fully justified.
- They should be required for only those over 2500sqm.
- The expansion or mezzanine creation in an existing unit should be treated differently to new development.
- Follow national guidance - a lower threshold is too restrictive and unnecessary.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- A threshold of 1,000 square metres to be applied in relation to Impact Assessment requirements, as there is no evidence to justify that a lower threshold be applied..

List of respondees:

Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mrs Randle
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
John Lewis Partnership
Mr White- Wrenbridge
PZ Cussons
Coal Pensions Properties Ltd and RREEF UK Retail Property Fund

Issue 3d: Providing Employment Land

Q 3.10: Do you have any comments on the potential sites for employment, as set out in Appendix 1 and the maps in Appendix 2?

No comments were received for this question

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- No comments were received for this question.

List of respondees:

No comments were received for this question.

Q 3.11: What employment uses do you believe should be permitted on sites identified as potential employment allocations? Predominantly 'B' Use Classes, or are they also suitable for other uses?

- There was a mixed response to this question, though the majority of responses believed that other employment generating uses should be permitted on some sites.
- A developer considered that Nottingham Business Park should only be restricted to B1 uses in the northern part.
- A representation considered that other employment generating uses should be allowed where they are ancillary or complimentary.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option contains development principles for each site which may include other uses. This will, where appropriate allow other employment generating uses to be permitted on some sites.
- The Preferred Option contains a policy on major business parks and industrial estates which will allow non-B class employment generating uses in exceptional circumstances.
- The Preferred Option contains a criteria based policy for other existing employment sites which will, where appropriate, allow other uses on existing employment sites.
- The Preferred Option puts forward Woodhouse Park (formerly Nottingham Business Park South) as a mainly residential site

List of respondees:

Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
Ms Jude- Sycamore Development
Mr Giles
Reverend Wright- Trent Vineyard
Mr Hartley- Lorne Estates Ltd
PZ Cussons
Peel Holdings Ltd
Mr Neville

Q 3.12: Are there any additional sites over 0.5ha you are aware of that may be suitable? If so, please fill in the separate consultation response form entitled 'Additional sites'

No comments were received for this question.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- No comments were received for this question.

List of respondees:

No comments were received for this question.

Issue 3e: Existing Employment Sites

Q 3.13: Should policies explicitly identify and protect strategically important employment sites, including industrial estates and other sites of local value or importance to an individual neighbourhood? If so, how would we define them?

- There was a mix of responses to this question but generally respondents were more in favour of protecting sites, especially strategically important ones.
- A respondent considered that Forest Mill would make a good retail location.
- A representation stated that such restrictions are counter productive and harmful to economic and social regeneration.
- A representation stated that the City Council should review the protected strategic employment area boundaries to ensure that land which has established, non B use class uses on it should be excluded from the boundary.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option contains a policy for Major Business Parks/Industrial Estates with additional locations than those currently in the Local Plan. It will also, where known, not include areas which are not currently B-use eg around Trent Vineyard
- The Preferred Option contains a policy on major business parks and industrial estates which will allow non-B class employment generating uses in exceptional circumstances

List of respondees:

Mrs Silvester - Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Ms Corbett - Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
Maryland Securities
Councillor Longford - Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP

Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
Mr Camm
John Lewis Partnership
Ms Jude - Sycamore Development
Reverend Wright - Trent Vineyard
PZ Cussons

Q 3.14: Are there any additional Issues and Options that you consider relevant to the economy that have not been considered in this document?

- While there may be aspirations for Grade A offices in Nottingham, the funding available in other cities is not necessarily available in Nottingham. Aspirational schemes by high-profile architects may not be deliverable within the constraints of local funding and realistic sale/rental expectations.
- The development of the tourism/cultural industries must be considered important to the future of Nottingham, but as yet we have a relatively poor offer, with a history of museums closing, historic buildings being lost and the historic Castle area being segregated from the rest of the city centre by Maid Marian Way. Promotion of a cohesive cultural sector should be encouraged.
- Note that there are a number of sites in St Ann's and Dales with proposals to change from the current employment designation to other uses. Concerned that efforts are made to promote employment sites, possibly in other locations, to counteract these losses in an area of high unemployment.
- A high demand from students for housing has helped push up house prices and rental values and removed a substantial amount of good quality housing from permanent residents. If we wish to provide more housing without relying on the greenbelt, we should also consider how we house large number of students.
- Theatres are the mainstay of your cultural offer and should be acknowledged here. Their maintenance and enhancement will allow them to continue to provide vitality to the evening economy, provide opportunities for young people to learn a broad range of skills associated with the dramatic arts, and there is a growing awareness of the role that the arts and culture play in developing an educated workforce and, on the other side of the coin, in attracting an educated workforce as residents. Theatre buildings contribute to the quality of the built environment especially in a town centre, and to the wider historic setting. There should be an overarching policy to promote and protect your existing established cultural facilities.
- Several responses commented that there should be more emphasis on tourism and culture
- Where are we trying to get investors from? Are we trying to attract big firms from the South to the Midlands?
- Could Zoning of the City Centre be done? - zoning could potentially achieve two things: a) improve the experience for visitors of the city

centre at night by avoiding a 'clash of cultures'; b) a reduction of crime as a result of separating the different uses of the city centre at night and separating the different clienteles.

- Agree that the City Council as planning authority takes steps to control the future conversion of new shops, catering and financial premises into off-licences, where evidence shows issues of harm to amenity, crime and disorder are likely to arise.
- The Planning Authority should adopt a presumption against the future conversion of new shops, catering and financial premises into off-licenses, for example by imposing a planning condition to exclude alcohol being sold, where evidence suggests issues of harm to amenity, crime or disorder would arise were such a conversion to take place.
- Appropriate intervention levels i.e. how to define what levels of reported existing crime/amenity issues in an area would justify such action has been considered.
- The list of potential sites for retail and other town centre uses is inadequate in terms of identification of sites for such uses. The plan should identify broader areas where town centre uses are appropriate without being prescriptive as to specific sites.
- Uses falling within the B Use Class account for only a relatively small proportion of employment and it is unhelpful to restrict land that is intended to be provided for employment use solely to B Use Classes. Most of the larger employers in the City do not fall within the B Use Classes.
- The Victoria Centre extension would impact on Trinity Sq
- The boundaries of City Centre and PSA should take into account impact on hotspots for crime and disorder and particularly evidence relating to hospital accident and emergency admission due to alcohol related violence.
- Whilst the emphasis is on the retail/economic function, the importance of these local centres for providing a wide range of community, health, leisure and other services and facilities should be highlighted here.
- Castle Marina retail park should be recognised as a retail destination.
- The C4:Alfreton Rd boundary should be widened
- The boundary of C24: Bobbersmill boundaries should be changed to reflect map sent
- The boundary of C8 Carlton Road Centre should be extended to include the site known as Albany Works
- Carlton Road should be redesignated as a Local Centre once the new foodstore is in place

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option will contain development principles for each site which may include tourism and cultural uses and City Centre Quarters which identify the distinct characteristics of each area – including the Royal Quarter with a focus on entertainment.
- The housing policies address various types of housing need including student housing.
- The office market surveys indicate a shortage of Grade A offices but it is a valid point that resources are not always available, in this respect we are being aspirational.
- Many allocated sites in St Anns and the Dales are allocated for a range of uses, many of which will create employment.
- The City tries to attract investments from elsewhere whilst encouraging its indigenous businesses.
- It is not considered necessary to have a specific policy dedicated to theatres

List of respondees:

Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
Mrs Randle
Ms Freeman- The Theatres Trust
Ms Orrock- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Piper Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ropemaker Nottingham Limited
Mr Foster
Mr Miah
John Lewis Partnership
Ms Jude- Sycamore Development
Coal Pensions Properties Ltd and RREEF UK Retail Property Fund
Mr Neville
Asda Stores Limited
Mr Conboy Blueprint Ltd Partnership
Mr Giles

Chapter 4: Mixed and Balanced Communities

Issue 4a: Delivery of Housing Growth

Q 4.1: Do you have any comments on the sites set out in the schedule in Appendix 1 and the maps in Appendix 2?

- Redevelop brownfield land rather than valuable green spaces such as 'allotments' and 'former detached playing fields' which should be withdrawn.

- Local views should be taken into account before making any decision to reduce the quantity of open and green spaces in an area.
- The most suitable development site to kick start housing development in Dunkirk & Lenton is DS80, designated 'mixed use'.
- Other areas suitable for non-student housing are Prospect Place and adjacent warehouse, along with the auction site on Gregory Street/Lenton Lane.
- Unlikely that the totality of sites identified in Appendix 1 will be adequate to provide sufficient land for the required housing provision. Many more deliverable sites will be needed and the Plan should not preclude identification of sites under 0.5ha which could make a significant housing contribution given potential city centre densities. If not included there will be uncertainty as to their sustainability, availability and deliverability.
- One respondent commented that they can assist with engaging with local residents on a number of sites at an early stage as specific proposals emerge..
- Bringing sites back into use that are long term empty, derelict or under used is likely to be welcomed by local residents in many instances.
- Any amendments to housing provision within the Aligned Core Strategy needs to be reflected in the new Local Plan.
- The range and location of proposed housing sites included is unlikely to have any significant implications for housing provision and delivery in Derbyshire
- A respondent was against the development green spaces (i.e. detached school playing fields and allotments). These are important green lungs / amenity areas and should be retained, while brown field sites looked at for housing and other development;
- A respondent queried the degree to which the emerging Greater Nottingham Strategy is 'joined up'. Housing proposals are fundamental to the growth of the conurbation with implications for a wide range of related matters including transportation and other land uses/infrastructure. Nottingham is in a difficult position with the dropping of the regional context but that does not negate having a sound case for delivery of its housing target. It may unwittingly provide justification for development of green sites in the City. This adds yet more weight to the bringing forward of brown field sites in a strategic and proactive way.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Wide ranging consultation will take place for proposed development sites and their associated development principles during the Preferred Option stage of the LAPP.
- DS80 (The Western Club) is proposed as a residential development site in the Preferred Option stage of the LAPP.
- The warehouses on Prospect Place are considered as not suitable for housing in the SHLAA. Several sites along Gregory Street/Lenton Lane

h have been assessed and some of these are below 0.5Ha – the threshold for inclusion in the LAPP.

- Satisfying the provision of the Core Strategy does rely on many sites smaller than 0.5 hectares
- The Preferred Options contains policies relating to regeneration and reuse of brownfield sites.

List of respondees:

Mr Leslie MP
Ms Corbett - Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy
Councillor Longford - Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP
Nottingham City Homes

Q 4.2: Are there any additional sites over 0.5ha you are aware of that may be suitable? If so, please fill in the separate consultation response form 'Additional Site'.

- New Aspley Gardens suggested for residential use, being highly accessible and in an established residential area.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

Following further assessment, this site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. Please refer to the accompanying Site Appraisal document for a more detailed explanation of this decision.

List of respondees:

Mr White - Wrenbridge

Issue 4b: Provision of Affordable Housing

Q 4.3: Should we implement a standard 20% target for affordable housing across the City?

- This balanced approach reflects housing need and viability in Nottingham.
- Differing targets in different areas would be unworkable, potentially discouraging regeneration and delivery.
- Increasing targets for areas of higher land value i.e. near town centres would inhibit specialist housing developments for the local elderly population in these locations. Specialist housing for the elderly should be encouraged.
- Requires careful implementation to avoid building smaller properties (i.e. two bed) that appeal to transient population.

- The approach should be extended to student dwellings where a commuted sum would be appropriate.
- Gap funding may also be appropriate to meet targets and ensure properties appeal to families or other long terms residents.
- Scheme specific viability is a legitimate ground to appeal S106 housing contributions (see PPS3) and this should not hinder development in areas of tight viability.
- Affordable housing should only be provided where viable and necessary.
- Citywide standard rates may not be feasible i.e. due to higher land values or commercial viability.
- A varying threshold between larger and smaller sites in the interests of balanced communities and meeting local need is supported.
- LPA targets should be flexible, realistic and consider a lower percentage on previously developed land.
- Housing quality is a determinant of health and component of deprivation, which is variable across the city. Therefore differing targets city wide, in line with need, city would be logical.
- Differing targets across the city supported based on evidence of the Nottingham Core Affordable Housing Viability Assessment Report (as per the Gedling Borough approach).
- Properties risk devaluation if affordable housing has a negative impact on the local area.
- Supports different levels of affordable housing taking into account conditions of each area.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option contains a policy on affordable housing which sets a standard target for affordable housing across the City.
- The Preferred Option Affordable Housing policy will apply to student dwellings.
- Plan-wide viability testing of policies and sites will be undertaken prior to the Publication version of the LAPP.
- The type of affordable housing to be provided on site will be negotiated having regard to a number of factors including levels of affordability on the area and size, type and tenure in the area.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
 Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
 Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
 McCarthy & Stone Ltd
 Mrs Rose
 Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
 Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
 Mr Foster

Mr Foster- Gedling Borough Council
Ms Jude- Sycamore Development
Mr Giles
PZ Cussons
Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council
Nottingham Action Group for HMOs

Q 4.4: Should we implement different targets across the City based upon Table 4.2 and paragraph 4.12?

- Flexible, realistic and a sensible idea, allowing a sensitive neighbourhood-based approach to achieving balanced communities.
- Targets should have regard to particular site circumstance, housing market conditions, local land value and availability of gap funding.
- Targets should recognise varying demand and circumstance in different communities.
- Targets should be more specific than Ward based (a Ward does not necessarily represent a community).
- Targets should be ambitious and taken seriously citywide.
- There should be extensive consultation with Ward Councillors and local communities.
- Discretion and viability assessments supported.
- A citywide minimum target favoured with a varying threshold between larger and smaller sites in the interests of balanced communities.
- Disagrees - this approach would distort the market. S106 requirements in prime areas should be robustly enforced, with authorities who have split targets monitored to assess the affect on development.
- Differing targets would be unworkable, potentially discouraging regeneration and delivery (supports 20% citywide target).
- How would a proportionate system be devised that does not impact on homeowners or degradation of areas?
- Welcomes increased targets in some areas but feels it is unreasonable for lower targets in others where there is a need for affordable housing i.e. Sherwood, Bakersfield and Hyson Green.
- The categories in Table 4.2 (in 4.11) list a limited number of areas that do not match the map. The maps are unclear as to which areas are in which category.
- Supports different targets taking into account conditions of local areas.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP contains an Affordable Housing policy which sets out a standard 20% target for affordable housing across the City.
- The Affordable Housing policy will be subject to Plan-Wide Viability Testing to ensure that policies are deliverable.

- All of the Housing Sub-Markets listed in Table 4.2 are shown on the map in Figure 4.1. The additional areas identified fall under the 'Elsewhere' category in Table 4.2.

List of respondees:

Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
 Mr Leslie MP
 Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
 Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
 Mr Foster
 Sir/Madam- Nottingham City Homes
 Ms Jude- Sycamore Development
 Mr Giles
 Ms Mossman & Ms Silver- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement
 Sir/Madam- PZ Cussons
 Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
 Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council
 Nottingham Action Group for HMOs

Q 4.5: Should we set the threshold at 15 dwellings or implement a lower threshold in areas where the market relies on smaller sites?

- Adjust according to site.
- Favours a citywide minimum target with varying thresholds between larger and smaller sites in the interests of balanced communities.
- Keeping the threshold protects smaller sites being used for affordable homes.
- Supports 15 dwelling threshold, reducing this in higher cost housing areas could be helpful in delivering wider housing objectives (as set out in the SCS and City Housing Strategy).
- The threshold citywide accords with PPS3. However, there is a need to be viable, flexible and should not deter potential development.
- Keep it simple and cause less issues during planning activities.
- Why not set higher threshold (25-30 dwellings) for poor areas?
- Commuted sums suggested in lieu of provision on sites in some cases.
- A respondent expressed an interest in providing/managing new affordable housing in the city.
- This threshold should be a minimum.
- Lower thresholds would prejudice delivery of small sites, would not be economically sustainable or provide a manageable provision of affordable housing.
- Support, but with flexibility to allow for a lower threshold on smaller sites.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Affordable Housing policy in the Preferred Option sets the threshold at 15 dwellings or 0.5 hectares , irrespective of dwelling numbers.
- The Affordable Housing policy does state that, where it can be robustly justified, off-site provision or a financial contribution will be sought.

List of respondees:

Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Nottingham City Homes
Ms Jude- Sycamore Development
Mr Giles
PZ Cussons
Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council
Nottingham Action Group for HMOs

Q 4.6: Should we set the proportion of social rented and intermediate? If so, what target would be suitable based on evidence?

- Supported, is worth consideration and could have benefits.
- May be necessary for a flexible attitude to proportions, varying by submarket.
- Favours a citywide minimum target with varying thresholds between larger and smaller sites in the interests of balanced communities.
- Disagree - cannot realistically be set in the LAPP and should be left to supplementary guidance that can respond to changing needs.
- Flexibility rather than targets is preferred as this is a very site specific requirement.
- Notes that social rented housing is a requirement through S106 (rather than solely affordable rented tenure).
- Proportions should be assessed with reference to demand data and analysis of housing costs in relevant area.
- Yes, there should be as much intermediate as possible to encourage people to stay.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Affordable Housing policy within the Preferred Option requires affordable housing contributions to contain a mix of Social Housing and Intermediate Housing that meets local need for affordable housing. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment will be the primary evidence base for determining this need.

- Reference to the amount, type and tenure of affordable housing already in the locality of the development will also be taken into account when determining planning applications.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Leslie MP
 Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
 Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
 Nottingham City Homes
 Ms Jude- Sycamore Development
 Mr Giles
 PZ Cussons
 Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
 Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council
 Nottingham Action Group for HMOs

Q 4.7: What are the implications of the Government's new 'Affordable Rent' and how should we plan to respond to this?

- Tenants will wish to live in more popular wards should rent increase and this is where new council homes should be built.
- The proposal(s) will not deliver affordability, essential in Nottingham.
- Pursue real affordable housing, ensuring properties for purchase are ring fenced for those in established need.
- The high cost of rented housing where there are large numbers of HMOs is noted.
- A citywide minimum target for affordable housing is favoured with varying thresholds between larger and smaller sites in the interests of balanced communities.
- More affordable housing is likely to be built.
- Potential for non RSL provision of affordable housing may arise and should be encouraged.
- Existing Council housing stock should be used to provide sub affordable rent or social rent housing.
- The Nottingham rental market is not overpriced, being cheaper than mortgages on similar properties. Believes it should be controlled by the market, subject to benchmarking.
- Suggests flexibility in the planning process to allow direct developer/RSL negotiations regarding affordable housing products (to meet demand).
- Will result in conversion of existing Registered Provider's (RP) housing stock to affordable rent. RP new build will be of an affordable rented tenure in the next 5 years.
- S106 agreements, where viable, should ensure supply of new social rented housing.
- It should be resisted. Household incomes stretched further and negative

consequences result to local businesses and families. It is wrong to ask those in most need of the Council's support for more money, quality of life will be adversely affected.

- The proposal will not make a significant positive contribution to affordable housing in Nottingham, nor is it in the city's best interest.
- Given the City's housing market conditions and prices, it is unlikely that rent levels would generate significant sums for re-investment in social housing, undermining provider's incentive to offer the product.
- 'Benefit trap' - higher rents increase likelihood of Housing Benefit eligibility, reducing a tenant's incentive to move off benefit and into work.
- Social housing which avoids 'affordable rent' should be explored.
- Increased pressure for all types of rented accommodation, especially HMOs, along with possible increases in rents.
- Consider providing 'purpose built' (converting commercial/industrial units to flats for those who would otherwise seek HMOs).

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Affordable Housing policy in the Preferred Option states that provision of Affordable Rented housing will not usually be an appropriate form of contribution.
- It is considered that as a majority of new affordable housing delivered by Registered Providers through other routes will be Affordable Rent tenure, the City's requirement for this product, as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, is likely to be fulfilled by this route. The Affordable Housing policy therefore requires that the Social Housing proportion of the Affordable Housing Section 106 contribution to be Social Rented tenure and not Affordable Rent.
- The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2012 update) recognises that there is a proportion of the City's citizens whose circumstances mean that Affordable Rent will be an appropriate product. This is however, a relatively small proportion compared to the number of citizens for whom Social Rent is the more appropriate product.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble - Nottingham City Council
Dr & Mrs Fletcher - Nottingham Action Group
Mr Leslie MP
Mrs Rose
Councillor Fox - Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford - Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP
Nottingham City Homes
Mr Giles
PZ Cussons
Mr De-max - Nottingham City Council

Issue 4c: Family Housing

Q 4.8: Should we set a target for family housing outside the City Centre?

- Generally supported.
- Needs to be flexible, site specific, proportionate and carefully considered.
- Areas should not should be overloaded.
- There is already a shortage of family housing.
- This is essential for the goals of mixed/balanced communities and addressing housing shortage. Housing provision could otherwise end up market driven with no method of influence in favour of citizen's needs.
- Requires successful planning control to ensure family homes are used as intended.
- Would fulfil objectives of the SCS (Nottingham Plan to 2020).
- Appropriate proportions of these family homes should be of an affordable tenure.
- Quality specialist accommodation for older people, the need for smaller housing to replace those identified for demolition by NCC and demographic trends should be considered.
- Changes to the housing benefit system will likely increase demand for smaller, 1 bedroom units citywide.
- Targets are measurable and will gauge policy success or failure.
- May help smooth degradation imposed from social housing introduction to redress social balance.
- Will happen in any event as private flats are unlikely to viable for the foreseeable future due to lack of market and bank finance.
- Disagrees - such targets have no realistic basis in the city boundary, the issue being a consequence of tightly drawn administrative boundaries. The provision of family housing across the conurbation needs considering.
- It's inappropriate to engineer provision contrary to need and demand arising from market conditions and genuine development potential.
- Too restrictive and could stifle delivery of sites.
- Opposes targets - all sections of the community should be catered for (not just families).
- Questions how this will be achieved.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Housing Mix policy in the Preferred Option sets out that the City Council will encourage development of sites for family housing as opposed to other forms of residential accommodation. It was not considered appropriate to set targets for the amount of family housing outside of the City Centre.
- The Housing Mix policy states that a number of factors will be taken into account when applying the policy, such as local evidence of housing need and demand.

- The Housing Mix Policy is in line with Policy 8 (Housing Size, Mix and Choice) of the emerging Core Strategy. The Core Strategy assesses housing need across the conurbation.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
 Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
 Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
 Mr Leslie MP
 Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
 Mr Richardson
 Mrs Rose
 Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
 Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
 Ms Armstrong
 Residential Landlords Association
 Nottingham City Homes
 Ms Jude- Sycamore Development
 Mr Giles
 PZ Cussons
 Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
 Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Lucas

Issue 4d: Houses in Multiple Occupation

Q 4.9: Should planning permission for new or extended HMOs only be granted outside those areas where there are existing ‘significant concentrations’ of HMOs, and if so should a standard minimum and potentially maximum thresholds be applied to establish which those areas are? How should appropriate thresholds be defined?

- The number/concentration of HMOs is merely a useful rule of thumb approach towards empirically determining the factors that affect whether a neighbourhood is balanced or not, e.g. demographics, housing tenure.
- Thresholds are useful in order to avoid a situation where only subjective assessments can be made of what is ‘too many’ or indeed ‘not enough’. It is essential to define a minimum threshold.
- There is an argument to be made for the desirability of establishing a maximum threshold above which permission will be given from a new HMO, so that C3 property sales for C3 use are not disadvantaged. Suggest that a range between 80% and 90% is a potentially useful starting point.
- What needs to be determined is the percentage (concentration) of HMOs within a radius of a property (suggest within 50-100m of property) where an application has been made for permission for a new HMO or extension of an existing HMO.

- Not necessary to state that planning permission is only granted/refused outside of areas of significant concentration or otherwise. The aim should be to grant as much freedom as possible to the Council and Development and Control Committee to shape communities.
- There is a clear need to set a maximum threshold for the proportion of HMO's in a neighbourhood.
- Development of threshold should support wider policy concerns of the Council - represent the Council's commitment to creating balanced communities.
- The current 25% threshold in the BCC is too high.
- Government changes to Housing Benefit and Single Living Allowance are likely to foster an increased demand for HMOs in the near future.
- This approach would 'spread the load' but could also spread the blight. Doubt that it significantly improves conditions in current HMO areas.
- It is necessary to define areas not just that are currently under pressure but that are predicted to come under pressure in the future, bearing in mind that restrictions on development in some areas will cause displacement nearby.
- Maximum thresholds would stand in the way re-establishing balance in some neighbourhoods. The threshold should be around 10%.
- Permission for new or extended HMOs should only be granted outside areas where there are existing concentrations of HMOs.
- Flats/apartments are more suitable for student accommodation and the Council must insist this is the way forward. Such accommodation could be sited in various locations given the excellent public transport links to both universities.
- In favour of threshold lower than the 25% threshold because, in areas where the predominant household size is small, even a small number of HMOs can quickly overwhelm the local resident population in terms of proportion of the population.
- The issues of HMO's are grossly overstated and is a factor of economic necessity. It is inappropriate for the Council to seek to preclude new or extended HMO's control over management and maintenance which can be exercised by the grant of planning permission is appropriate.
- HMO's make an important contribution to the provision of housing at the very lowest end of the market and that without them there is likely to be an increase in homelessness. The role of HMO's is therefore critical to reducing homelessness.
- The majority of the buildings that can be economically adapted to be HMO's lie within the city centre boundary and in particular locations. It is unrealistic to seek to prevent such buildings being used or to reduced concentration of HMO's. The issue is one of management and of the City Council taking its wider responsibilities to address social deprivation in those areas and not a function of land use planning policy.
- A quota system is wrong in principle. Strongly opposed to the setting of quotas limiting the numbers of HMOs in specific areas where there is supposedly currently a concentration. There is a strong argument for saying that such accommodation would be better off concentrated in those areas.

- Strongly disagree with the concept of “balanced” community. The reality is that one cannot turn the clock back and families will not return to these areas.
- The aim should be to protect areas which currently have relatively low numbers of HMOs but are vulnerable to an increase because they are adjacent to areas of high concentrations.
- It would be sensible for the sake of clarity and transparency to have thresholds which are used to make decisions about (a) whether planning permission should be required and (b) if it is required whether it should be refused.
- Suggest system which takes into account the type of housing with a lower limit of 20 m radius (for smaller properties in close proximity to one another) and an upper limit of 50 m radius (for well-separated, detached properties).
- A minimum threshold of 5-10% is required. A maximum threshold of 75-90% will allow an owner to sell their C3 property for continued C3 use or for conversion into an HMO. A measure for the concentration of HMOs in any one area could be a 50 - 100 metre radius of the HMO in question.
- Part of the attraction of Nottingham's Universities is the vibrant life in close proximity to the sites. In deterring this it will make it less appealing to prospective students. However, for other forms of HMOs it probably would be worth capping in some areas to preserve the social balance.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option includes a policy for assessing HMO and purpose built student accommodation proposals. The policy incorporates a 10% threshold in relation to student households and other HMOs in an area (above which that area will be judged to have a ‘significant concentration’ of student households and HMOs and planning permission will not usually be granted for further HMO and purpose built student development). Whilst the 10% threshold is the primary consideration and provides a strong indication of the likely acceptability or otherwise of a proposal, the policy incorporates supplementary factors that enable some flexibility to respond to other site specific considerations.
- The Preferred Option carries forward similar methodology to that contained within existing policy for the purpose of defining the area of measurement which is based on a cluster of census output areas formed from the output area within which the site under consideration is situated and all adjoining output areas, for which a statistically significant calculation can be made.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
 Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
 Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
 Mr Leslie MP
 Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
 Mrs Marsh

Mr Richardson
Mrs Rose
Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Ms Armstrong
Residential Landlords Association
Nottingham City Homes
Mrs Curran
Mr Giles
Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council
Mr Lucas
Miss Wakefield

Q 4.10: When assessing planning applications for new or extended HMOs how should the points set out be considered?

- Character/amenity criteria important - the creation of HMOs could result in the subdivision of existing historic properties to the detriment of their architectural and/or historic value, while the proliferation of HMOs could harm the local character of places.
- Concern stated if 'regeneration objectives' were used as an excuse for development of HMOs.
- The emphasis that appears to have been put on 'student' households is questioned. It is HMOs that the LAPP must be concerned with, not exclusively student occupied HMOs, or indeed student purpose built. It is the proportion of existing households in a defined area or locality which is important, regardless of whether the occupants are students or another demographic, socio-economic, etc. group.
- Bearing in mind that the occupancy of HMOs is at least twice that of the equivalent C3 'family' home, it is the number of HMO households and hence the number of HMO tenants that is going to contribute to the population profile and hence to population imbalance.
- The third bullet point highlights the fact that it is the total number of (in this instance) students in an area which affects not just factors such as demographic, socio-economic balance, but, through these, the character and amenity of an area. So this also has to be part of the assessment procedure.
- Regeneration considerations are a factor which may need to be considered. However, they should not outweigh all other considerations.
- The proportion of existing HMOs already in an area should be considered and the proportion of households in a locality made up purely of full-time students. The overall number of students residing in a locality (taking into account both individual student households and purpose built student bedspaces) should not be considered.
- Quantifying the 'character' of an area is impossible and can often reflect

the opinions of a limited selection of residents or Councillors. The usefulness of this aspect of a planning application could be quite limited.

- Disagree that the proportion of existing properties already in HMO use in any area should be taken into account. This is not the function of the land use based planning system.
- The proportion of households in the locality made up solely of students should not be taken into consideration. This is clearly contrary to the provisions of the Use Classes Order which refers simply to small HMOs (as well as sui generis HMOs) but these are looked at in terms of the type of accommodation; not their occupation.
- Re the impact of proposals on the character and the amenities of the area if there is no proven/demonstrable harm in planning terms and if there are any issues of concern these can be dealt with under other legislation.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option includes a policy for assessing HMO and purpose built student accommodation proposals. The policy incorporates a 10% threshold in relation to student households and other HMOs in an area (above which that area will be judged to have a 'significant concentration' of student households and HMOs and planning permission will not usually be granted for further HMO and purpose built student development). Whilst the 10% threshold is the primary consideration and provides a strong indication of the likely acceptability or otherwise of a proposal, the policy incorporates additional factors that enable some flexibility to respond to site specific considerations.
- The additional factors include individual characteristics of the building or site and immediate locality, evidence of existing HMO uses and purpose built accommodation provision within the immediate vicinity of the site that already impact on local character and amenity, impact on the character and amenity of the area, management and parking, wider regeneration benefits of proposal and whether the proposal is in an area where there is express policy support for purpose built student accommodation.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
Mr Richardson
Mrs Rose
Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith

Ms Armstrong
Residential Landlords Association
Nottingham City Homes
Mrs Curran
Mr Giles
Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council
Mr Lucas

Q 4.11: Are there any other factors that should be taken into account when considering planning applications for new or extended HMOs?

- Purpose-built accommodation; encourage use of these.
- It is important that account is taken of a balanced need for service such as schools, public transport, leisure facilities, 'local' rather than just 'student' pubs, local retail and convenience shopping.
- The impact on service provision is a factor that needs to be taken into account when considering planning applications for new or extended HMOs.
- The proximity of purpose-built homes to elderly residents must mitigate against planning permission being given for a new HMO or extension of an existing HMO.
- Consideration of impact on waste collection.
- Consideration of increased parking pressures and how they will be addressed.
- Steps requiring the landlord/developer to mitigate negative consequences arising from the proposal e.g. regular inspections, gain accreditation.
- Take account of the wishes/needs of individual potential sharers who want to be close to their places of work/study.
- NCH recognises problems caused by over concentrations of HMOs in parts of the city and tenants living in neighbourhoods with high levels speak regularly of those concerns. In certain areas (e.g. as per para 4.21) there are serious problems of housing market imbalance caused by these concentrations, as well as housing affordability problems created as a result of high cost HMO housing.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Preferred Option includes a policy for assessing HMO and purpose built student accommodation proposals. The policy incorporates a 10% threshold in relation to student households and other HMOs in an area (above which that area will be judged to have a 'significant concentration' of student households and HMOs and planning permission will not usually be granted for further HMO and purpose built student development). Whilst the 10% threshold is the primary consideration and provides a strong indication of the likely acceptability or otherwise of a proposal, the policy

incorporates additional factors that enable some flexibility to respond to site specific considerations.

- The additional factors include individual characteristics of the building or site and immediate locality, evidence of existing HMO uses and purpose built accommodation provision within the immediate vicinity of the site that already impact on local character and amenity, impact on the character and amenity of the area, management and parking, wider regeneration benefits of proposal and whether the proposal is in an area where there is express policy support for purpose built student accommodation.
- The Preferred Option also incorporates general design, amenity, conservation, noise and parking policies that would be applicable to HMO proposals.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mrs Rose
Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Ms Armstrong
Residential Landlords Association
Mrs Curran
Mr Giles
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Q 4.12: Are there any types of location/property that could generally be suitable for HMO use, e.g. unused accommodation within shopping frontages on major transport routes?

- There should not be an automatic assumption in favour of HMO use of the locations/properties stated in 4.12, but consideration of each case on its merits.
- Use the locations/properties stated in 4.12 rather than currently mainly family residential streets, etc.
- There should not be a presumption that certain types of location/property are suitable. Such sites might also be suitable for family housing and this should be given priority.
- Use the locations/properties stated in 4.12 may be acceptable subject to caveats that (a) conversion to HMO use must not take place in such a way as to cause concentrations of HMOs, and that they are not located within neighbourhoods where there are existing problems with HMOs, and (b) there should be no process of conversion subject to specific planning approval so that local people, neighbours of the property and the wider community can, if they wish, comment on, support, or object to any

specific applications.

- Anywhere that families are reluctant to live.
- Areas with empty properties that are in need of investment.
- There may be some suitable properties, such as accommodation above shop frontages or accommodation close to major transport routes but this will be insufficient to meet the demand which will arise during the proposed plans lifetime.
- There may well be community-based groups who are interested in shared living, e.g. co-operatives for which certain types of building might be suitable
- Aim for more space conscious developments around the City and using more mixed developments in areas not affected by large numbers of HMOs eg around Castle Marina retail.
- New supermarkets should be considered to take student accommodation on upper levels but not within residential areas.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option does not set out particular types of locations that are considered to be suitable for HMOs, but policy is included that enables site specific factors to be taken into account when considering proposals, including location and characteristics of property, in addition to the primary consideration of whether or not an area has a 'significant concentration' of student households and HMOs.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Richardson
Mrs Rose
Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
RESIDENTIAL LANDLORDS ASSOCIATION
Mrs Curran
Mr Giles
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Issue 4e: Delivery and Location of Student Housing

Q 4.13: Should we aim to locate student housing in certain areas, including University Campuses, near to University Campuses, on the fringes of the City Centre or in the City Centre?

- More appropriate on or near to campuses. On fringes rather than in city centre: unbalances demographic of city centre. But try to avoid family-oriented suburbs.
- To impose a “one size fits all” solution is unworkable. If the plans to divert students from Lenton/Dunkirk to purpose built accommodation, which will be more expensive and further away come into play then this could have a real negative impact on Nottingham students’ experience. This will impose higher rent costs and extra travel expense for more students who will be facing £9,000 tuition fees per year.
- Development of student accommodation should be considered on the University campuses, but discouraged in the neighbourhoods near to the campuses and the fringes of the city centre, which are already under acute stress. In the city centre, development should be considered sensitively and flexibly, so that areas of other types of accommodation are not blighted.
- Student housing should be located on university campuses, city centre.
- An increase in student number should be matched with an increase in purpose built student accommodation. Site should be sought within land owned by the Universities.
- Do not support location close to university campuses if, by doing so, the student housing will create an imbalance, or will exacerbate existing problems with balance and sustainability.
- What is the definition of city centre fringes?
- In principle, the suggestion to locate student housing in the city centre, especially if it regenerates unwanted buildings. However, there are city centre locations with family housing where the impact of student housing could be detrimental to the amenity and character of what are essentially residential areas.
- The University of Nottingham and Trent University should be encouraged to add more purpose built accommodation on their campuses.
- Given the relatively tightly drawn administrative boundaries of the city, it is unnecessary and unrealistic to restrict the location of student housing to any particular area or areas. Whether or not student housing is acceptable should be determined by the physical characteristics of the particular site and the proposal including sustainability factors.
- The demand for purpose built student accommodation located in the city centre outstrips supply so much so that currently students are occupying accommodation (flats) in the city centre that were not designed specifically for them. More purpose built accommodation in the centre of the city will address this and not impact on the balance of any residential communities. There are issues around developing student accommodation on sites near to the University of Nottingham as these tend to be in areas which will impact on local residents.
- Campuses must be the first choice for student housing.
- The fringes of the City Centre are only suitable for student accommodation if there are special reasons for the development, e.g. regeneration of an un-used factory or office block – though bed spaces should be restricted.
- Yes to university campuses but not near to university campuses because it

will create imbalance and further saturation. Only on the fringes of the city centre where it will regenerate an area, an office block or redundant factory. The best area will be the up-coming new Regeneration Zones at Eastside, Southside and Waterside.

- Student housing should be located on university campuses, city centre. the main focus for new developments should be along the route of the future tram from around the Station to Chilwell.
- Why are you trying to locate students anywhere in the first place? Students should have the right to live where they choose to, just like everybody else, so long as they can pay the rent.
- Concentrating even more students in one area than occurs naturally is likely to drive up rental costs discouraging students from coming to Nottingham.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option incorporates a policy setting out locations where purpose built student accommodation will be encouraged (subject to accordance with other relevant policies including area based policies such as City Centre Quarter Policies). Specified locations include allocated sites, university campuses, the City Centre and other Centres within the retail hierarchy.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Kasper- University of Nottingham Students' Union President
Mr Leslie MP
Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
Mr Richardson
Mrs Rose
Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Mrs Curran
Mr Neal
Mr Giles
Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council
Mr Lucas

Q 4.14: Are there any other general locations that could be appropriate for student housing?

- Close to city centre e.g. Alfreton Rd.

- It may be beneficial to look at dispersal of student housing along good transport routes, for example the tram routes, and the Southside Regeneration Zone.
- It is necessary to identify existing unwanted commercial and industrial buildings, and then explore the possibility of adapting and re-commissioning them to provide cluster flats, apartments, etc. for tenants.
- Office blocks which are no longer 'fit for purpose' are most likely to be located in the City Centre. However, there may be other locations where these buildings can be used to provide appropriate accommodation.
- Existing residential housing which is not likely to meet the requirements of modern families, examples being flats above shops, small terraced houses with limited rear garden/yard space which front directly on to the street, particularly if the location is on a busy road.
- Waterside, Eastside and Southside Regeneration Zones.
- A range of forms of housing including both cluster flats and studio apartments should be provided to meet the needs of the differing types of studio and differing needs of students across the broad areas and age ranges that they cover.
- On campus developments or in the city centre so as not to further upset the balance of the local neighbourhoods.
- Locations which are away from residential communities, but which have excellent transport and communication links to the Universities tend to work best.
- Unused office blocks in the City Centre.
- This question should be answered by students. As much student input as possible should be encouraged, including from the Students' Union.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option includes a policy setting out locations where purpose built student accommodation will be encouraged (subject to accordance with other relevant policies including area based policies such as City Centre Quarter Policies). Specified locations include allocated sites, university campuses, the City Centre and other Centres within the retail hierarchy.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
 Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
 Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
 Mr Leslie MP
 Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
 Mrs Rose
 Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
 Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
 Mr Smith
 Mr Neal

Mr Giles
Ms Mossman & Ms Silver- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement
Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Q 4.15: What type of housing (e.g. cluster flats or studio apartments) should be provided to ensure it is as attractive to students as possible, whilst maximizing purpose built provision?

- Perhaps a starting point in answering this question is to look at the reasons why students prefer HMOs and then see whether these reasons can be used to inform the design, etc. of future purpose build.
- Studio apartments.
- Cluster flats housing up to 6 or 8 students should be built. To ensure it is attractive to students, purpose built should provide similar car parking spaces as students find in residential areas.
- Consider design, cost, and location.
- A range of forms of housing including both cluster flats and studio apartments should be provided to meet the needs of the differing types of studio and differing needs of students across the broad areas and age ranges that they cover.
- Provide a mix of types of provision.
- A mix of purpose-built student apartment complexes and HMOs.
- HMO's. The current system works fine, stop messing with it.
- Generally cluster flats appeal to the student market more so than studios.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option policy supports purpose built student accommodation of an appropriate 'scale and design' (in the right locations). It is not prescriptive about the precise format, but general design policies require attention to be given to future adaptability for potential alternative uses and the achievement of high quality in terms of function, amenity and sustainability.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
Mrs Rose
Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Nottingham City Homes
Mrs Curran

Mr Day- Nottingham City Council
Mr Neal
Mr Giles
Mr Hartley- Lorne Estates Ltd
Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Q 4.16: Are you aware of any sites over 0.5ha that would be suitable for allocation for student housing? If so, please fill in the separate consultation response form entitled 'Additional Sites'.

- Peoples College (DS35);
- Riverside Way (DS62);
- Southside regeneration sites (DS63,DS65, DS68 and DS69);
- Boots (DS76);
- The following sites should be considered for student accommodation, having been designated for mixed use and on transport links to the Universities:
 - Arkwright Street East (DS63);
 - Sheriffs Way/Arkwright Street (DS65);
 - Sovereign House (DS68);
 - Waterway Street (DS69);
- Beechdale Baths (DS90) would be an ideal location for large purpose built student accommodation, dispersing students away from current concentrations;
- Lenton and Dunkirk has a disproportionately large student population so purpose built accommodation should be located in other areas of the city.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- These sites have been considered in preparation of the Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Mr Harte - Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Ms Corbett - Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy
Councillor Longford - Nottingham City Council
Nottingham City Homes

Issue 4f: Housing for Older People and Special Needs Housing

Q 4.17: Should we identify specific sites for development for older people and special needs housing. If so, how should locations be determined? If you are aware of any sites over 0.5ha, please fill in the separate consultation response form entitled 'Additional Sites'.

- Supported - with a view to retaining balance in neighbourhoods, rather than creating 'ghettos'.
- Weight should be given to the provision of sites that meet the criteria for specialist housing for the elderly, particularly location. Given the difficulties finding suitable sites, requests the Council considers sites that are deliverable and developable for such specialist housing. A policy should be introduced with wording similar to "Development proposals for accommodation designed specifically for the elderly will be encouraged provided that they are accessible by public transport or a reasonable walking distance to community facilities such as shops, medical services, places of worship and public open space."
- The location of older persons housing is critical to ensure that they are integrated into the community.
- Dunkirk Fire Station should be used for housing and/or housing for the elderly. There are other areas more suitable for student accommodation.
- Is important for the city to develop specific sites for older people's accommodation and special needs housing. Dependant on type, locations should have access to local facilities and adequate public transport, for residents, visitors and staff. Such accommodation can also be a source of local employment in the support services.
- There is no need to set or identify specific sites for such development as facilities will be provided if there is sufficient flexibility in the LAPP policies.
- The concept of disabled persons, including people with learning difficulties, being ghettoised onto specific housing sites is not supported, that these should be located in the mainstream community.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP contains a policy on Specialist Housing which contains criteria against which planning applications will be judged. Accessibility to public transport and other services are listed within the criteria.
- There are Land Allocations in the Preferred Option that list suitability for elderly housing provision in the Development Principles. In addition, many of the other Land Allocations do not preclude housing for the elderly and other types of specialist housing from being developed.
- The Preferred Option specifies that a proportion of homes should be to a Lifetime Homes Standard. This is a nationally recognised standard that

seeks flexible, adaptable and accessible homes that can respond to changes in individual circumstances.

- Dunkirk Fire Station has a current application pending for a University Technology College. This site remains a Land Allocation in the Preferred Option and education and/or commercial are listed as suitable uses within the Development Principles.

List of respondees:

Mr Leslie MP
McCarthy & Stone Ltd
Councillor Longford - Nottingham City Council
Mr Harte - Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr De-max - Nottingham City Council

Q 4.18: Should we set a target for the type of specialist housing required, e.g. bungalow?

- General support.
- Targets are necessary so that success can be measured.
- Makes clear progress towards meeting the challenges of demographic change in the future which would otherwise be dictated/tend towards more profitable housing (e.g. students) at the expense of meeting population and citizen's demands.
- It is important to resist/protect their use/conversion to HMOs.
- Bungalows play a vital role in enabling elderly and disabled people to remain in the community, minimising the need for expensive stair lift installations.
- The provision of bungalows in varied locations encourages people to move out of larger houses into nearby accommodation, where they do not have to disconnect from their community. This process frees up much needed family housing for use by younger people.
- There may be benefits setting targets for the different types of specialist accommodation given pressure on land for various uses in the urban area, making use of the population trend data outlined in 4.30.
- All developments should include a percentage of housing which is fully wheelchair adapted /accessible as well as a proportion of properties built to Lifetime Homes standards. Building accessible and Lifetime Home standard properties should be both in the affordable and 'non-affordable' markets;
- Provide accommodation that will ensure people remain as independent as possible for as long as possible. Flats with communal laundry etc facilities would also work and Sweden has some very good examples of housing for the elderly.
- Supports the idea that individual neighbourhoods should be in a position to support the changing requirements of their elderly population, noting that flexibility in the type of provision is essential.

- Authorities set minimum percentages of Lifetime Home development standards to ensure the nationally recognised shortage of accessible homes or homes easily adapted is improved upon. For example, GLA have set 100% target for all new housing developments. Need to respond to an aging population and growing numbers of younger disabled people looking for accessible housing as independents and not part of a care complex. Lifetime Homes design standards also supported avoiding the need for people having to move or substantially alter their premises to meet their changing needs. Creating a balanced social spectrum of residents in neighbourhoods. There is extensive research on cost arguments for this design concept from Habinteg and The Joseph Rowntree Foundation;
- Concerned that accessible/adaptable housing for disabled people is not covered in this section (considers it illogical to be located in Chapter 6 under Attractive and Safe Neighbourhoods);
- There is an existing Manifesto commitment to encourage developers to build bungalows and other housing places for older people across the city.
- Disagrees - There is no need to set or identify specific sites for such development as facilities will be provided if there is sufficient flexibility in the LAPP policies;
- Disagrees - different types will be suitable for different areas. Internal specification and design of shared facilities etc may be more important than whether the housing is a flat or a bungalow.
- Disagrees - should be encouraged during the planning process.
- Disagrees - has to relate to demand and the market. All housing has to comply with building regulations on mobility. Other types of housing should be provided by housing associations.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Policy 8 (Housing Size, Mix and Choice) of the emerging Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategy states that consideration should be given to the needs and demands of the elderly as part of the overall housing mix, in particular in areas where there is a significant degree of under occupation and an ageing population. It goes on to state that the appropriate mix of house size, type, tenure and density within housing development will be informed by local evidence. The housing policies in the LAPP link to this policy and particularly emphasise the importance of providing bungalows.
- The Preferred Option specifies that a proportion of homes should be to a Lifetime Homes Standard. This is located within the 'Design and Enhancing Local Identity' section of the Preferred Option version of the LAPP.
- It is not considered appropriate to set prescriptive targets for the delivery of specialist housing in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP as it is considered that there is a sufficient range of sites within the LAPP to provide specialist accommodation in terms of choice, size

and location. In addition, much of the development of this type of housing will be provided by the private sector and, in the current economic climate, it is not possible to predict realistic targets for delivery throughout the plan period. Every opportunity will be taken to encourage the provision of this form of supply (in line with Policy 8 of the emerging Core Strategy and the housing policies in the LAPP) through pre-application discussions and S.106 Agreements.

List of respondees:

Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mrs Rose
Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Ms Armstrong
Sir/Madam- Nottingham City Homes
Mrs Curran
Mr Day- Nottingham City Council
Ms Jude- Sycamore Development
Mr Giles
Ms Mossman & Ms Silver- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement
Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Issue 4g: Conversion of Other Uses to Residential

Q 4.19: Should we only permit change of use to residential where the points set out can be demonstrated?

- General support.
- Should be subject to the same conditions as Q4.9/4.10.
- An additional bullet point suggested - 'no adverse impacts on the historic environment'. Change of use of long term vacant historic property could secure its future, but this should only be where the public benefits outweigh any harm.
- A sensible list but should also consider further points such as the impact of converting a facility to a residential property on local services and the consequential impact on future residents.
- Conversions of industrial premises should carefully consider whether the local environment is appropriate to the needs of future residents.
- Conversion to residential use affords the option of more mixed use sites which can be appealing to certain occupier groups as well as developing i.e. 'work / live' unit opportunities which may have a place in the city's housing market. The provision of residential above e.g. flats over shops, or offices also serves to make good use of land. There are benefits from having local employment sites (even where these may

not be the highest value use of the land concerned) since they can provide employment opportunities at a neighbourhood level which can have benefits in terms of reducing travel to work times or car dependency.

- There is a need to maintain a sufficient supply of employment land as such land is limited with the city's boundaries. Suggests the need for safeguarding policies on existing sites where appropriate otherwise there is a risk that the protection of employment sites and premises, especially non strategic sites, may be undermined by a generally permissive approach allowing residential conversion directly resulting in the loss of important employment land or indirectly through incremental piecemeal change.
- Planning permission for change of use to residential use should be generally permitted and should not be restricted if the city is to meet its housing land requirements.
- Disagrees - each case should be individually reviewed and judged on its merits.
- Disagrees - the criteria set is too narrow and particularly does not take into account the wider economic context, for example the Nottingham Office Forum report referred to at paragraph 3.21 of the document.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The LAPP's Preferred Options contains a range of policies relating to the preservation of the historic environment and safeguarding of previously used employment sites, in addition to location, amenity and compatibility considerations for residential proposals.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Ms Armstrong
Nottingham City Homes
Ms Mee
Mrs Curran
Mr Foster- Gedling Borough Council
Mr Giles
Mr Hartley- Lorne Estates Ltd

Issue 4h: Gypsies and Travellers

Q 4.20: Should we identify specific sites for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation? If you are aware of any sites over 0.5ha, please fill in the separate consultation response form entitled 'Additional Sites'.

- Accommodation need from 2012 onwards should be addressed. No time frame set out for DPD but family growth up to 2028 alone would require a significant number of new pitches - 53 pitches (2010-28). The evidence base needs updating. The GTAA does not make allowance for people moving into the area which could have implications. Specific sites should be identified in order to meet the need. The criteria against which sites are assessed is currently too restrictive and needs to change.
- The number of additional pitch requirements identified in the Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs assessment was met by the City through the delivery of private sites. Post 2012 the Council will need to refresh its needs assessment. Prior to the completion of this refresh it is unclear if there will be need for substantial additional expansion of site places however if a need was identified this could be dealt with through a policy detailing where applications for traveller sites are appropriate rather than a site specific allocation.
- There should be appropriate provision, sensitively managed.
- Gypsy & Traveller accommodation is not a priority for the Council with time and resources focussed on our citizens. If there is a need for such provision, this could be detrimental to potential family housing, local businesses, student accommodation, HMOs or local businesses.
- There is limited need or requirement for the identification of such accommodation in the city.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The City Council is currently in the process of jointly reviewing the methodology to assess/calculate Gypsy & Traveller accommodation needs with neighbouring authorities across the housing market area to ensure an up-to-date and robust evidence base. Following review and implementation, the publication version of the LAPP DPD would be the most appropriate method for addressing accommodation needs, if required. The Aligned Core Strategy currently sets out the broader strategic objectives for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

List of respondees:

Ms Alice De La Rue - Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Mr Chris Leslie MP
Councillor Fox - Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP
Nottingham City Homes

Issue 4i: Schools and Educational Facilities

Q 4.21: Are you aware of any sites over 0.5ha that would be suitable for allocation for education? If so, please fill in the separate consultation response form entitled 'Additional Sites'.

- Does not agree with developing green spaces (i.e. detached school playing fields and allotments). These are important green lungs / amenity areas and should be retained, while brown field sites looked at for housing and other development;
- The Sandfield and Peoples College sites.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Sandfield Centre and the Peoples College site are not considered to be required for educational uses and have been included within the Preferred Option document for suitable alternative uses.

List of respondees:

Mr Leslie MP
Ms Corbett - Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy

Q 4.22: Are there any additional Issues and Options that you consider relevant to mixed and balanced neighbourhoods that have not been considered in this document?

- Approach which aims to provide housing and other development that meets the needs of the community is supported.
- It is important to have a policy objective for the return of family houses to family occupancy, as it is design to ensure that new development is fit for purpose and visually sensitive to its surroundings.
- Private sheltered accommodation schemes specifically for the elderly will have a key role in addressing housing needs. Owner occupied private housing for the elderly has multiple benefits for both the residents and the wider community. The Council needs to acknowledge the City's projected rise in the elderly population and be positive that it is addressed within the Plan.
- Does not show land owned by the City Council and other public bodies, or small sites under 0.5ha. Small sites may be suitable for combining with adjacent owners in Community Land Trusts to accommodate low cost housing development. The Mutual Home Ownership model should be used where these Trusts can be set up.
- Housing tenure. No reference to the contribution different types of

tenure can make to sustainable 'family' housing. Housing Co-operatives and co-housing projects are more likely to retain occupants, creating opportunities for people to be involved in the planning and management of their homes and in the creation of new housing developments suitable for differing types of occupant. There should be a commitment to such forms of tenure with targets set.

- Mix of tenures. Low rates of owner occupation and social rented undermines long stay residents. There is a need to increase both of these groups but the demand for student housing needs to be satisfied to relieve the pressure on development sites by identifying locations away from the ward which are attractive i.e. on the tram route and in areas perceived as safe.
- The Universities should develop an impact assessment of their own policies and student numbers, sharing and discussing these with the Council.
- The Government's prevention of S106 money helping to deliver affordable housing is an outrage and we should make this clear at every opportunity given clear housing shortages in Nottingham. Every available tool is need to address this problem, pleased to see target figures for new homes remain unchanged following abolition of the Regional Strategy.
- More account of local community services and shops (post offices, corner shops) and their role in efforts to build balanced and mixed communities.
- The document does not suggest sites for purpose built student accommodation. If the Council's/LAPP's aim is to try and mitigate the impact of HMOs on local communities elsewhere then these sites need to be identified, along with consultation with students in order to develop and design such sites that will meet the needs and demands of local people, the Council, and the students.
- Suggests developing the centre of Lenton with mixed housing type and tenure when flats are to be demolished so people can remain living in the community.
- Childcare facilities and healthcare provision. There is need for mental health facilities in Clifton.
- Green belts should not be altered for any buildings, including schools.
- Public transport and connection to amenities.
- Domestic off-street parking.
- Outdoor space and restricted areas i.e. the volume of dilapidated play parks is high.
- Housing targets are a fundamental issue for the City and one which residents need to be involved with. Given the current financial uncertainties globally and the likelihood of a longer term recession, it is unrealistic and would be unsound for the Local Plan to seek an increase in the annual figure of housing completions to make up for the low level of completions in previous years. Whilst these aspirations may be laudable they are unlikely to buck the reality of the market place. This unsoundness needs to be addressed now rather than later in the plan process.

- The timetable indicates adoption by March 2014. By that time the data/background work for the housing assessment would be almost a decade old with the plan dealing with a very different economic and growth scenario.
- It would be helpful for residents to understand approximately how much land needs to be allocated to meet the current housing target so that they can get a feel of how implementable it is over the plan period. This would go a long way towards having a more rational debate about the target. The consultation report states that the current target would be achievable and desirable but without any indication of how. Residents need more information on this.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The need to plan for the elderly population is noted. The Preferred Option makes positive provision for the elderly within the development management policies. Some of the land allocations in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP specifically state provision for the elderly a preferred use for sites and also scope to include this type of provision within the other residential allocations. The Housing Nottingham Plan sets out that Nottingham's aspiration for older people is for a home for life. Retirement housing offer needs to be flexible, sustainable and available in all tenures in order to suitably accommodate and equally as important to appeal to older people with a variety of needs and available resources. The Preferred Option version of the LAPP therefore specifies that a proportion of homes should be to a Lifetime Homes Standard. This is a nationally recognised standard that seeks flexible, adaptable and accessible homes that can respond to changes in individual circumstances.
- Development sites and their associated development principles, including sites for purpose-built student accommodation, are proposed as part of the Preferred Option version of the LAPP. Key criteria for these sites will be access to public transport and safety.
- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP will only show land allocations above 0.5ha. Smaller sites are considered in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
- The City Council liaises with the universities to ascertain student numbers, which are then monitored against student bedspaces completed in the City.
- Policy 8 (Housing Size, Mix and Choice) of the emerging Nottingham City Core Strategy states that residential development should maintain, provide and contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes. Housing mix will be informed by local evidence such as the local demographic context and trends and local evidence of housing need and demand. The housing policies within the Preferred Option version of the LAPP are to be read in conjunction with the emerging Core Strategy.
- The need for affordable housing in the City is noted. The Preferred Option version of the LAPP will include a policy on affordable housing.

- The Preferred Option Version of the LAPP contains a policy on Community Facilities and the land allocations include provision for community facilities.
- A planning application for development at the Lenton Flats has now been approved.
- Two minor amendments to the Green Belt are proposed in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP.
- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP contains transport policies and designations on the accompanying Policies Map which seek to secure public transport improvements in the future.
- Domestic on-street parking provision is a very detailed matter that is outside of the remit of the LAPP.
- A full revision of the Open Space Network has been undertaken for the Preferred Option version of the LAPP. The revised Open Space Network has been mapped and is a matter for consultation at the Preferred Option stage.
- Housing targets will be set out in the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategy. This document is due to go to a Public Examination at the end of 2013. The Examination will assess the soundness of the plan and ultimately the housing targets to ensure that the targets are appropriate.

List of respondees:

Ms De La Rue- Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
 Ms Newman- Natural England - Nottinghamshire and Lowland Derbyshire
 Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
 Mr Sims- Clifton Mental Health Carers Group
 Mr Leslie MP
 Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
 McCarthy & Stone Ltd
 Mrs Randle
 Mr Richardson
 Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
 Mr Smith
 Nottingham City Homes
 Mr Giles
 Mr White- Wrenbridge
 Mr Harte- Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
 Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Buffery- Derbyshire County Council
 Mr Neville

Chapter 5: Rejuvenating Neighbourhoods

Issue 5a: Regeneration Zones

Q5.1: Have we identified the correct Regeneration Zones? If you are aware of additional areas, please fill in the separate consultation response form entitled 'Additional Sites'.

- Agrees that the zones are the correct areas to focus priority development over the plan period. Notes that each of the individual areas require a variety of interventions however and this should be recognised within the emerging policy as opposed to retaining the same messages from the historic policy of the Local Plan and preceding IPGs.
- Southside, Eastside and Waterside all have historic environment issues, both containing and being within the setting of heritage assets.
- Recognises the need for regeneration but considers that in rejuvenating identified zones, the vitality and viability of centres must not be prejudiced.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The concept of Regeneration Zones is carried forward in Policy 7 of the emerging Core Strategy. The City Council has reviewed its approach to these in the light of current economic circumstances, and proposes to designate new City Centre Quarters which recognise each area's distinct characteristics. There will be 4 City Centre Quarters including the Canal Quarter - with a focus for new high quality office accommodation, Creative Quarter – with a focus for creative industries (including Life Sciences) and offices including low cost incubation space, Castle Quarter – with a focus for heritage led regeneration and high quality office development and the Royal Quarter - with a focus on entertainment and high quality offices. Waterside remains a focus for regeneration with a more incremental targeted approach to development taking account of commercial viability.
- The Preferred Option includes policies aimed at protecting and enhancing the vitality and viability of the City Centre.

List of respondees:

Peel Holdings Ltd
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge - English Heritage (East Midlands)
John Lewis Partnership

Q 5.2: Should we shift emphasis away from the comprehensive redevelopment previously suggested for the Waterside, Eastside and Southside Regeneration Zones in favour of more incremental and targeted development that takes greater account of commercial viability in the current economic climate?

- General support for a more incremental and targeted approach.
- A more incremental and targeted approach could be better for the historic environment than comprehensive redevelopment, allowing new development to be stitched into the historic fabric of each zone.
- Comprehensive development of the major regeneration sites is still an appropriate ambition and should be a policy of the LAPP. However the Council has been too prescriptive in its requirements for development within those areas and it is this, along with market conditions, that have precluded the regeneration sites coming forward. More flexibility in terms of use and form is required on the part of the Council in considering development proposals within the regeneration zones. The Council also needs to be more proactive with its powers of land assembly and with the provision of infrastructure to support the regeneration.
- Focus on regeneration welcomed. There may be a strong case for proceeding with more selective redevelopment in the current economic climate but that this should be within the context of the overall objectives for the areas concerned so that the long term vision can be achieved.
- Southside regeneration could be kick-started with purpose built student accommodation aimed at the University of Nottingham.
- Believes it is more realistic to pursue an incremental approach in light of the current economic climate and unattractiveness of some locations within the Waterside, particularly due to the incinerator.
- There is scope to bring forward some areas within Nottingham Waterside in the short term and developer interest exists to achieve delivery. Targeted development should be encouraged where it complements the development framework for the area. This will assist in delivering the longstanding aim of regenerating Nottingham Waterside in what is currently a challenging economic climate.
- In the current market targeted individual site development will better achieve growth. Whilst current conditions are holding back development, the previous conditions were highly suitable and yet they still didn't develop.
- Development should not have a detrimental impact on existing employment and residential sites, especially in areas such as Sneinton that have high levels of deprivation.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The concept of Regeneration Zones is carried forward in Policy 7 of the emerging Core Strategy. The City Council has reviewed its approach to these in the light of current economic circumstances, and new City Centre Quarters are proposed. There will be 4 City Centre Quarters including the Canal Quarter - with a focus for new high quality office accommodation, Creative Quarter – with a focus for creative industries (including Life Sciences) and offices including low cost incubation space, Castle Quarter – with a focus for heritage led regeneration and high quality office development and the Royal Quarter - with a focus on entertainment and high quality offices. Waterside remains a focus for regeneration with a more incremental targeted approach to development taking account of commercial viability.
- A Preferred Option Policy is included for each ‘Quarter’ and Waterside setting out key strategy and supporting proactive partnership working in respect of land assembly, funding and infrastructure delivery.
- A number of the larger mixed use allocations within the former Regeneration Areas (now quarters) have been divided into a greater number of smaller Preferred Option allocations to support a more incremental and focussed approach to development.
- Development principles accompanying individual land allocations within the Preferred Option have been prepared to strike a balance between providing necessary clarity and strategic approach to the delivery of uses whilst maintaining a degree of flexibility.
- Sites in close proximity to Nottingham Station promoted for office led development within the Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Dickinson- Canals & River Trust
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Ms Armstrong
Nottingham City Homes
Mr Giles
Mr Hartley- Lorne Estates Ltd
Peel Holdings Ltd

Q 5.3: Should we revise the boundaries of the Waterside, Eastside and Southside Regeneration Zones, as set out in the plans contained in Appendix 4.

- Comprehensive development of the major regeneration sites is still an appropriate ambition and should be a policy of the LAPP. However the Council has been too prescriptive in its requirements for development

within those areas and it is this along with market conditions that have precluded the regeneration sites coming forward. More flexibility in terms of use and form is required on the part of the Council in considering development proposals within the regeneration zones. The Council also needs to be more proactive with its powers of land assembly and with the provision of infrastructure to support the regeneration.

- Any boundary revisions should take account of the potential historic environment impact and the implications of including or excluding heritage assets from each zone.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The concept of Regeneration Zones is carried forward in Policy 7 of the emerging Core Strategy. The City Council has reviewed its approach to these in the light of current economic circumstances. New City Centre quarters are proposed which recognise each areas distinct characteristics. There will be 4 quarters including the Canal Quarter - with a focus for new high quality office accommodation, Creative Quarter – with a focus for creative industries (including Life Sciences) and offices including low cost incubation space, Castle Quarter – with a focus for heritage led regeneration and high quality office development and the Royal Quarter - with a focus on entertainment and high quality offices. Waterside remains a focus for regeneration with a more incremental targeted approach to development taking account of commercial viability.
- A Preferred Option Policy is included for each ‘Quarter’ and Waterside setting out key strategy and supporting proactive partnership working in respect of land assembly, funding and infrastructure delivery.
- A number of the larger mixed use allocations within the Regeneration Areas (now quarters) have been divided into a greater number of smaller Preferred Option allocations to support a more incremental and focussed approach to development.
- Development principles accompanying individual land allocations within the Preferred Option have been prepared to strike a balance between providing necessary clarity and strategic approach to the delivery of uses whilst maintaining a degree of flexibility.
- The Preferred Option includes specific policies with regard to the historic environment and heritage assets.

List of respondees:

Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge - English Heritage (East Midlands)

Q 5.4: Should we designate additional Regeneration Zones around the Meadows or Radford?

- Comprehensive development of the major regeneration sites is still an appropriate ambition and should be a policy of the LAPP. However the Council has been too prescriptive in its requirements for development within those areas and it is this along with market conditions that have precluded the regeneration sites coming forward. More flexibility in terms of use and form is required on the part of the Council in considering development proposals within the regeneration zones. The Council also needs to be more proactive with its powers of land assembly and with the provision of infrastructure to support the regeneration;
- Suggests an additional regeneration zone in the Radford area, noting that whilst progress has been made in terms of area's revitalisation, much remains to be done. The area has substantial weaknesses on most measures of socio-economic deprivation, while much of the physical structure is not fit for purpose. The population size of the area with its deep-seated problems, along with its proximity to the city centre, justifies considerable public and private efforts to focus upon restoring the area's social and economic health. While there is little articulation in the document on what allocating the area as a regeneration zone would entail, if it directs further attention and resources to resolving the identified problems it must be supported;
- Both areas are in need of regeneration and have historic environment issues that will need to be addressed as part of any proposals;
- This is worth considering. The provision of school places is essential in Nottingham East, where in some areas there are growing numbers of school-age children. Playing fields and other green space are also essential for rejuvenating neighbourhoods and encouraging people to stay for the longer term.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option identifies the Waterside and 4 City Centre Quarters as areas for targeted regeneration and transformation through new development.
- The Meadows and Radford areas are not designated as regeneration areas within the Preferred Option. It is considered that new opportunities to develop Neighbourhood Plans provides a more appropriate vehicle to capture community level aspirations for planning and regeneration.

List of respondees:

Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Chris Leslie MP

Maryland Securities
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge - English Heritage (East Midlands)

Q 5.5: Have we identified the correct uses for each of the Regeneration Zones?

- Comprehensive development of the major regeneration sites is still an appropriate ambition and should be a policy of the LAPP. However the Council has been too prescriptive in its requirements for development within those areas and it is this along with market conditions that have precluded the regeneration sites coming forward. More flexibility in terms of use and form is required on the part of the Council in considering development proposals within the regeneration zones. The Council also needs to be more proactive with its powers of land assembly and with the provision of infrastructure to support the regeneration;
- Considers that the Southside Regeneration Zone requires a different approach rather than the blanket promotion of a mix of uses. Suggestions the creation of sub and character areas. Considers, for example, that the area focused around Sheriffs Way/Arkwright Street extending towards Wilford Road could provide an opportunity to create a high quality commercial office quarter within which a critical mass of prime office development could be created;
- Southside regeneration could be kick-started with purpose build student accommodation aimed at the University of Nottingham.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The concept of Regeneration Zones is carried forward in Policy 7 of the emerging Core Strategy. The City Council has reviewed its approach to these in the light of current economic circumstances and new City Center quarter are proposed which recognise each areas distinct characteristics. There will be 4 City Centre Quarters - including the Canal Quarter - with a focus for new high quality office accommodation, Creative Quarter – with a focus for creative industries (including Life Sciences) and offices including low cost incubation space, Castle Quarter – with a focus for heritage led regeneration and high quality office development and the Royal Quarter - with a focus on entertainment and high quality offices. Waterside remains a focus for regeneration with a more incremental targeted approach to development taking account of commercial viability.

List of respondees:

Mr Waumsley - Freeth Cartwright LLP
Councillor Piper - (Nottingham City Council)

Issue 5b: Key Regeneration Sites

Q 5.6: Do you have any comments on the sites set out in the schedule in Appendix 1 and plans in Appendix 2?

None received

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

N/A

List of respondees:

No comments were received for this question.

Q 5.7: Are there any additional sites over 0.5ha you are aware of that should be considered as key regeneration sites? If so, please fill in the separate consultation response form entitled 'Additional Sites'.

None received

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

N/A

List of respondees:

No comments were received for this question.

Q 5.8: Are there any additional Issues and Options that you consider relevant to rejuvenating neighbourhoods that have not been considered in this document?

- Regeneration zones provide some of the best opportunities to create high quality open green spaces within development. It is essential that the LAPP highlights the opportunities provided by regeneration for green infrastructure, along with other sustainable development opportunities such as use of brown or green roofs.

- Include Broadmarsh centre in a regeneration zone, demolishing the centre and replacing it with green urban space that would encourage restaurants, cafes and bars. There is also a need for a decent pedestrian thoroughfare connecting from this site to the city, providing a logical connection for trams, buses and trains.
- Considers that the Southside Regeneration Zone does not have sufficient profile to drive forward investment at present as there is no specific 'vision' to allow potential investors to understand how the area will be created and will work as a destination.
- Suggests redeveloping Mansfield Road & Alfreton Road for affordable and council housing.
- There is potential for regeneration areas in many other parts of the City. For example, there are concentrations of older industrial sites which are located close to parts of the City in need of improvement. The River Leen, which runs from Lenton through to Bulwell, lies at the heart of much of Nottingham's original industrial development. An overall strategy for its improvement and/or regeneration plans for selected parts of that area could help uplift and revitalise this part of the City. The tram provides an unrivalled accessibility corridor for regeneration and development purposes for some of this area and this should be capitalised on in the emerging Local Plan.
- When considering regeneration, do not destroy existing character of an area.
- Concentrate on specific areas to encourage small businesses to grow, providing help with special rates.
- Better/improved sustainable links to the countryside.
- Rejuvenating neighbourhoods should not involve knocking down old, there should be a presumption in favour of retaining all buildings over 100 years old. Protection for allotments also should be included.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- New quarters and proposals for allocated sites seek to capture wider regeneration benefits of development.
- Design and historic environment policies seek to enhance the physical environment through both reuse and redevelopment.
- Preferred Option seeks to support the councils wider aspirations for economic growth set out in the Growth Plan.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
 Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
 Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
 Mr Leslie MP
 Mrs Randle
 Maryland Securities
 Mr Smith
 Ms Armstrong
 John Lewis Partnership

Ms Cross
Nottingham City Homes
Ms Mee
Peel Holdings Ltd
Mr Neville

Chapter 6: Attractive and Safe Neighbourhoods

Issue 6b: Design Guidance

Q 6.1: Should we require new development of 10 dwellings or more (i.e. major development) to take account of Manual for Streets?

- Generally supported, though some felt a more flexible approach would be preferable.
- Standards should include student accommodation, which should be of high quality.
- LAPP should be flexible rather than prescriptive, allowing for need, demand and the market.
- Standards such as building for life and internal space etc are more appropriately dealt with under building regulations.
- Standards need to be balanced against viability considerations and to set standards in absolute terms through planning policy could discourage development.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Manual for Streets provides design guidance that extends beyond residential settings to encompass both urban and rural situations.
- The Preferred Option sets out a variety of criteria that would be taken into consideration when determining planning applications, making reference to local and national guidance. Whilst Manual for Streets guidance is not explicitly referred in the policy wording, it is referenced in the supporting justification text.
- The Preferred Option contains specific sections concerning Context and Place Making and Building Design and Use, as well as a number of policies relating to student accommodation.
- Amenity and quality of living environment are material planning considerations, addressed in the Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith

Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Q 6.2: Should we continue to require new development of 10 dwellings or more (i.e. major development) to meet Building for Life 'Silver' standard?

- Generally supported.
- Standards should include student accommodation, which should be of high quality.
- LAPP should be flexible rather than prescriptive, allowing for need, demand and the market.
- Standards such as building for life and internal space etc are more appropriately dealt with under building regulations.
- Standards ultimately make homes more expensive.
- Standards need to be balanced against viability considerations and to set standards in absolute terms through planning policy could discourage development.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option sets out a variety of criteria that would be taken into consideration when determining planning applications, making reference to local and national guidance. Whilst Building for Life guidance is not explicitly referred in the policy wording, it is referenced in the supporting justification text.
- The Preferred Option contains specific sections concerning Context and Place Making and Building Design and Use, as well as a number of policies relating to student accommodation.
- Amenity and quality of living environment are material planning considerations, addressed in the Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Mr Foster
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Q 6.3: Should we require developments to meet Lifetime Homes standards?

- Generally supported.

- Standards should include student accommodation, which should be of high quality.
- Lifetime homes standard would ensure properties remain suitable for people as needs change.
- LAPP should be flexible rather than prescriptive, allowing for need, demand and the market.
- Standards such as building for life and internal space etc are more appropriately dealt with under building regulations.
- Standards need to be balanced against viability considerations and to set standards in absolute terms through planning policy could discourage development.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option set out a variety of criteria that would be taken into consideration when determining planning applications, making reference to local and national guidance. Whilst Lifetime Homes guidance is not explicitly referred in the policy wording, it is referenced in the supporting justification text.
- The Preferred Option contains specific sections concerning Context and Place Making and Building Design and Use, as well as a number of policies relating to student accommodation.
- Amenity and quality of living environment are material planning considerations, addressed in the Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
 Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
 Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
 Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
 Mr Smith
 Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Q 6.4: Should we apply locally derived internal and external space standards to new residential development?

- Generally supported.
- Standards should include student accommodation, which should be of high quality.
- LAPP should be flexible rather than prescriptive, allowing for need, demand and the market.
- Standards such as building for life and internal space etc are more appropriately dealt with under building regulations.
- Specific detailed guidance on streetscape design required to promote physical activity and other health benefits.

- Standards need to be balanced against viability considerations and to set standards in absolute terms through planning policy could discourage development.
- Adequate space essential to ensure properties are attractive to long term residents to help towards stable communities.
- Locally derived internal and external space standards for new residential developments are essential.
- Unless there are minimum standards, what constitutes a 'family house' is subjective.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option set out a variety of criteria that would be taken into consideration when determining planning applications, making reference to local and national guidance in the supporting text i.e. Manual for Streets, Lifetime Homes and Building for Life standards, along with the Council's forthcoming Neighbourhood Design Guide.
- The Preferred Option contains specific sections concerning Context and Place Making and Building Design and Use, as well as a number of policies relating to student accommodation.
- Amenity and quality of living environment are material planning considerations, addressed in the Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Q 6.5: Should we apply different standards to different types of residential development, for example, student housing?

- Generally supported.
- Standards should include student accommodation, which should be of high quality.
- Requirements for temporary uses should be differentiated from permanent uses.
- LAPP should be flexible rather than prescriptive, allowing for need, demand and the market.
- Standards such as building for life and internal space etc are more appropriately dealt with under building regulations.
- Standards are less important for specialist temporary units such as student accommodation.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Options set out a variety criteria that would be taken into consideration when determining planning applications, making reference to local and national guidance;
- The Preferred Options contains specific sections concerning Context and Place Making and Building Design and Use, as well as a number of policies relating to student accommodation;
- Amenity and quality of living environment are material planning considerations, addressed in the Preferred Options.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Mr De-max- Nottingham City Council

Issue 6c: Letting Boards

Q 6.6: Do you agree that, if the application for a Direction is successful, the proposed enforcement guidance will be sufficient for managing 'To Let' boards in the affected areas?

- Generally supported.
- Enforcement/monitoring required to ensure success.
- May be necessary to extend areas covered by letting board control.

- Care is needed in the restriction of to let boards as landlords need to be able to advertise the availability of their property.
- Council's policies and approach to HMO's and student accommodation cause the proliferation of to-let boards as a consequence of not permitting more purpose built student accommodation and allowing HMOs but with proper management arrangements.
- Letting boards not only detract from the visual amenity, but also signal that the local population is a transient one, and the neighbourhood is not one that 'ordinary' people would want to live in.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Preferred option policy included relating to the pursuit of enforcement action in respect of unauthorised adverts.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
 Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
 Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
 Ms Corbett- Dunkirk and Lenton Housing Strategy Group
 Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
 Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
 Mrs Curran
 Mr Giles

Q 6.7: Are there any additional Issues and Options that you consider relevant to attractive and safe neighbourhoods that have not been considered in this document?

- No specific question or questions have been posed regarding the historic environment. The only issue raised relates to conservation area designation, but there are many other issues that could be discussed and addressed by the LAPP.
- There are a large number of saved policies from the 2005 Nottingham Local Plan that relate to the historic environment and would be worth carrying forward into the LAPP, such as Policy BE15 on caves and Policy BE8 on tall buildings.
- Issues such as preserving/enhancing historic townscape character should be addressed within the LAPP to assist with development management decisions within the city.
- The LAPP should contain sufficient detail regarding urban design issues for the city.
- Concern at impact of hot food takeaways etc on the local environment by way of late night opening/noise nuisance and traffic, litter. Recommend minimum thresholds for these premises along with reduced opening hours.

- Issues re open spaces in planning new developments, also in the management of existing.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP contains a specific section on the Historic Environment and there are a number of policies relating to Heritage Assets.
- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP contains a policy on Building Design and Use and a policy on Context and Place Making.
- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP contains a policy on Food and Drink Uses and Licensed Entertainment Venues Outside the City Centre this policy looks at the impact of hotfood takeaway on the local area and sets thresholds for these premises.
- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP contains a policy on Open Space in New Development. It will be linked to a revised Supplementary Planning Document which considers open space in further detail.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mrs Rose
Mr Young- Nottingham City Council
Ms Moore- Nottingham Local Access Forum
Nottingham City Homes
Mr Strange-Walker- Trent & Peak Archaeology
Ms Mee
Professor Walker- York Archaeological Trust

Chapter 7: Healthy Neighbourhoods and a Thriving Natural Environment

Issue 7a: Health and Communities

Q 7.1: Promoting healthier lifestyles and communities involves a wide range of policy areas, not just planning. Are all the relevant issues associated with the role planning policies can play in supporting the creation of healthier neighbourhoods referred to above? Are there others?

- Option put forward is supported.
- Planning for activity is important and planning has an important role to play in public health.
- There is a need for safe walking / cycling routes. Walking / cycle routes should be designed into new development.
- Need to protect playing fields. Sports pitch adjacent to former Greenholme School could provide playing space for current pupils with no access to sports fields.
- Transferring budgets to GPs will be unlikely to result in a number of smaller, neighbourhood focussed health facilities.
- Changes to the built environment have an impact on a wide range of public health issues.
- Planning and public health professionals should continue to work together in the city to identify priority public health determinants and outcomes that will help reduce health inequalities and improve health at the city and neighbourhood level in the longer term.
- The Council should consider the impact of allotments on health and the environment. Young people need to have access to allotments and / or food growing spaces.
- Green space should be promoted / preserved.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Greenholme school playing pitches have been included in the updated open space network later for consultation.
- A policy protecting allotments has been set out in the Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Mr Hyde- The Nottingham Park Residents Association
Mr Siebert- Nottingham Park Residents' Association
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Lee- Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Sir/Madam- Nottingham City Homes

Mr Roberts
Mr Giles
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council

Q 7.2: Should planning policies be used to restrict the development of new hot food takeaways within walking distance (e.g. 400 metres) of schools, parks, leisure centres, youth facilities and other similar locations? Or is the issue more related to opening hours and business practices rather than their location?

- Policy restricting takeaways within 400metres of schools is supported, but policy should be taken wider to target takeaways across the City.
- All you can eat buffets can contribute to obesity.
- Planning Policies should be used to restrict development of premises with alcohol licences as well as hot food takeaways in areas where they are already concentrated as well as in walking distance of schools.
- Issues not only relate to location, but also opening hours.
- Exercise within school hours is important. Cannot remove freedom of choice.
- Evidence that living within close proximity to fast food takeaway outlets has been associated with rates of obesity and weight gain.
- Local regulation to limit the density and over clustering of fast food takeaways in areas of higher deprivation or higher childhood obesity levels is supported.
- Need to look at how access to affordable healthy food can be promoted in areas where policy most likely to be enforced.
- Education of adults is the key of cracking the obesity issue to promote healthier eating, which is the main contributor to the crisis.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- A Preferred Option policy restricting hot food takeaways (not within an existing Centre) and within 400 metres of schools and certain facilities has been incorporated into document.
- Development Management policies are contained within the Preferred Option document that cover all food and drink and licensed entertainment venues, promote enhanced retail choice and local access to healthy convenience goods within the City's neighbourhoods.

List of respondees:

Mr Hyde- The Nottingham Park Residents Association
Mr Siebert- Nottingham Park Residents' Association
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association

Mr Leslie MP
Mrs Rose
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ms Armstrong
Nottingham City Homes
Mr Giles
Mr Neville

Issue 7b: Open Space

Q 7.3: Do you support making use of the ‘toolkit’ assessments, in the context of the Area Committees and the PPG17 Audit, where a proposed development would have an impact on open space? How could this be best applied or improved?

- There was general support for using a toolkit. However, there were concerns that it should not be too rigidly applied.
- The toolkit should include some analysis of the historic environment.
- The Toolkit approach is based on amount and location of different typologies. Whilst this is important, especially for Natural Greenspace, it could mean that a site in close proximity to an area that is well served could be considered for development, even if it has good potential for restoration of habitats already present. A mechanism to prevent this should be in place. The data informing the toolkit does not currently differentiate between different types of open greenspace so, for example, Wollaton Park is classified totally as parkland when in fact it contains significant areas of natural greenspace and a golf course, which have quite different ecological value.
- A representation stated that the Park Bowl is a substantial outdoor sports facility and as such should be protected against future development
- A representation stated that Open space may need to be released to provide housing. There is potential to release new Aspley Gardens to deliver a sustainable retail-led mixed use development.
- The toolkit assessment is proving to be a useful process for assessing impacts on the development of open spaces. The process has yet to be tested as is in its early stages and is therefore subject to ongoing developments and improvements. Any suggestions which come through the LAPP DPD consultation are welcome and already self assess the contents based on feedback from colleagues.

Toolkit can potentially be improved through a number of measures, including:

1. Separate section on biodiversity
 2. Monthly updates of datasets
 3. More information on outdoor sports facilities
 4. Further analysis of gaps in provision of all typologies
- Tool kits for assessing open space referred to in 7.11 can have value

through consistency of approach but can also be process orientated following a tick box assessment that deals with matters that can only be measured in terms of available hard data. If a tool kit is to be used, then it is essential that broader and sometimes more intangible matters are considered. These include:

- The contribution of that space to the local network and / or citywide network of open spaces.
- The contribution that space makes to the character and sense of place of an area
- The value of that space to the local community
- Lessons need to be learnt from the last Local Plan Inquiry where an Inspector determined that part of the Radford Bridge Allotments should be taken out of the open space network. The Inspector made the decision without a comprehensive and detailed assessment of all allotment sites in the City including their wildlife, amenity value to the community and contribution to the local network of spaces. There was no public consultation on the information used by the Inspector in making his recommendation.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The toolkit has been applied to the development sites and this has in turn informed the development principles for each site within the Preferred Option.
- The comments received have also been passed on to the Parks and Open Spaces section of the City Council for their consideration.
- The Preferred Option designates all of Radford Bridge Allotments as part of the open space network.
- Following further assessment, Aspley Gardens has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP.

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
Mr Siebert- Nottingham Park Residents' Association
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Lee- Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ms Armstrong
Ms Mee
Mr Giles
Mr White- Wrenbridge
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council
Mr Neville

Q 7.4: The approach proposed is based around the national guidance and local evidence, and recognises that the loss of some open space may be required to help achieve improvements to the open space network overall. Do you have any views about how this could be implemented?

- There was general agreement regarding open spaces that quality was more important than quantity, and that some losses were required to help achieve improvements overall.
- Where existing areas of open space are identified as being of poor quality consideration should be given to measures that could be implemented to improve the value of the site and the role of the green space to the overall strategic GI network before the land is allocated for development.
- The impact on the historic environment should form an important part of any approach dealing with the loss of open space
- The health impact of any potential loss of green space should be reviewed.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option considers quality and quantity of sites, and that some losses are required to help achieve improvements overall.
- The issues regarding the historic environment and health have been passed onto the Parks & Open Spaces section at the City Council who are responsible for the toolkit

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble- Nottingham City Council
Ms Newman- Natural England - Nottinghamshire and Lowland Derbyshire
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ms Mee
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council

Issue 7c: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Q 7.5: Should we identify areas for biodiversity offsetting on our proposals map? If so, how should these be selected?

- Any Green Infrastructure strategy at the local level should be consistent with the objectives of the 6Cs GI Strategy.
- Areas for biodiversity offsetting should be identified on the Proposals Map. These areas should be determined through a biodiversity opportunity

mapping exercise and should include the identification of GI corridors and areas of ecological importance with enhancement potential, such as Local Nature Reserves, Bulwell Hall Park etc.

- Areas should be identified in consultation with experts. Must not be used as an excuse for inappropriate loss of areas.
- Should aim to join up areas of biodiversity to improve resilience. Should provide minimum levels of biodiversity across the City.
- There are green spaces not well used that could be improved. Brownfield sites could also be enhanced which might make them more attractive to developers in the long term.
- DEFRA are currently looking into biodiversity offsetting. Notts BAG is currently developing a methodology. Methodology may need to be altered to fit with urban setting.
- Care is needed to ensure small scale habitat within City is not lost as developers contribute to improving land outside the City boundary.
- City should identify gaps in habitats and identify opportunities to bridge gaps. Should also consider use of green / brown roofs / walls.
- Areas for protection should be identified e.g. SINC / LNR / SSSI etc. These need to be updated annually.
- Offsetting is important to increase the biodiversity within the urban area. Biodiversity can also be promoted through planting trees as part of new developments and ensuring existing ones are replaced where lost.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- A policy for biodiversity offsetting has been incorporated into the Preferred Option.
- The policy on biodiversity offsetting sets out that it should only take place where the impact on biodiversity cannot be avoided or mitigated onsite. Proposals to provide offsetting outside the City Boundary will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances and where there is no suitable land available for offsetting within the City.

List of respondees:

Ms Newman- Natural England - Nottinghamshire and Lowland Derbyshire
Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Lee- Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Mr Smith
Ms Armstrong
Nottingham City Homes
Mr Giles
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council

Q 7.6: Should we identify boundaries for GI corridors?

- The majority of responses considered that we should identify boundaries for GI corridors.
- Boundaries will be restrictive, sometimes preventing enhancement opportunities on nearby land that would benefit a GI corridor. Would recommend that GI corridors are identified with a semi-transparent wash, giving fuzzy boundaries. This should ensure that, should a nearby beneficial enhancement opportunity arise, it can be implemented.
- The Park Estate could be included as part of the Green Infrastructure network.
- Scope for more local sites to be identified as Green Infrastructure including individual sites, which collectively constitute a green corridor and / or valuable local network of spaces. This provides a major opportunity for local communities across the City to get involved in the planning of their areas as advocated in the document.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Aligned Core Strategy identifies strategic GI corridors and the LAPP identifies an open space network.

List of respondees:

Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
Mr Hyde- The Nottingham Park Residents Association
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Smith
Ms Armstrong
Mr Giles
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council
Mr Neville

Issue 7d: The Green Belt

Q 7.7: Should we undertake a small scale revision of the Green Belt to remove the land at Farnborough and Fairham schools and Nottingham Business Park South?

- Alterations to the Green Belt can only be taken if there is an enforceable way of limiting the spread of such actions. Building on Green Belt or Former Green Belt should only be considered if development is zero carbon, i.e. had no impact on the environment. This would have two positive outcomes: would reduce pressure on Green Belt redevelopment and would give a boost to the eco housing industry.
- The Green Belt boundary should not be revised.
- The Green Belt boundary should be revised.
- A sequential approach to Green Belt would indicate that these areas

should not be taken out of the Green Belt. Clifton sites are part of the flood plain for Fairham Brook. Nottingham Business Park South only likely to be accessible by car.

- Revision of the Green Belt to enable development should be the last resort and where possible, brownfield sites within or adjacent to the urban area should be used first.
- Areas should be subject to the tests set out in PPG2 and the Regional Strategy before determining whether they should be removed from the Green Belt. A toolkit assessment may be beneficial in this process.
- There should be consideration towards buffering of nearby wildlife sites. Areas should be protected as per statement in section 2.6.xi
- Strongly object to proposal GB2 , also objecting to proposal DS83 -abuse-of Green Belt designation.
- DS81 –built-curtilage/component needs-not to encroach at this sensitive Green Belt location.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- A small scale revision to the Green Belt is proposed at Fairham College only following sustainability assessment.

List of respondees:

Mr Siebert- Nottingham Park Residents' Association
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Lee- Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Mr Smith
Ms Moore- Nottingham Local Access Forum
Ms Armstrong
Ms Mee
Mr Giles
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council
Mr Potter

Q 7.8: Are there any other areas that should be examined when considering reviewing the Green Belt within Nottingham City?

- There are no other areas.
- The typology of open spaces does not include individual gardens, which probably take up a wider total areas than all other open spaces.
- The health impact of any potential loss of green space should be reviewed.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- No further Green Belt revisions are proposed.

List of respondees:

Mr Hyde- The Nottingham Park Residents Association
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ms Armstrong

Issue 7e: Access to Key Open Spaces and the Countryside

Q 7.9: Should we target opportunities for improvements on routes and links from urban areas where access is currently poor, or should we focus on a more general approach of improving access to key open spaces from all areas?

- There was a mixed response with some considering that we should target opportunities for improvements on routes and links from urban areas where access is currently poor, and others considering that we should focus on a more general approach of improving access to key open spaces from all areas.
- Some representations thought access from deprived areas was important.
- Some representations considered it most important to have access to accessible open space.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Accessibility is a key criteria of the open space toolkit assessment, which is used if there are proposals entailing the loss of open space

List of respondees:

Ms Newman- Natural England - Nottinghamshire and Lowland Derbyshire
Mr McClintock- PEDALS
Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Lee- Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Mr Smith
Ms Armstrong
Nottingham City Homes
Ms Mee
Mrs Curran
Mr Giles
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council

Q 7.10: How might given improvements be taken into account in the 'toolkit' assessment approach to public open space as set out in paragraphs 7.11 and 7.12?

- There was also a general mix of views.
- The toolkit should assess the connectivity of the site to the wider environment, the role of the land in the overall GI network and the opportunity to enhance the site or improve the contribution the land may be able to make to the strategic GI network
- If the opportunity mapping exercise also identified opportunities to improve access to key sites and to rural areas, a GIS layer of access opportunities could be created for the toolkit.
- A systematic review should be undertaken – smaller open spaces initially.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The comments have been considered and have also been passed on to the Parks and Open Spaces section of the City Council for their consideration.
- The Preferred Option of the LAPP will designate some new areas of open space in the Open Space Network

List of respondees:

Ms Newman- Natural England - Nottinghamshire and Lowland Derbyshire
Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ms Moore- Nottingham Local Access Forum
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council

Q 7.11: Are there any additional issues and Options that you consider relevant to healthy neighbourhoods and a thriving natural environment that have not been considered in this document?

- All new build development should have a definitive wildlife corridor. We need to protect green and open spaced and have a better understanding of biodiversity. Incursions to the Green Belt should be avoided at all costs.
- Keen to ensure coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development. Where this is the case, prior extraction of the coal may be sought. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. Western and northern parts of the Nottingham area have been subjected to limited past coal mining activity, which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Within the Nottingham areas, there are approximately 192 recorded mine entries.

Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by the Local Planning Authority to ensure site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. Although mining legacy is as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development, delivered through the DPD, recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. Land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on the new development, rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed, the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.

- Previous comments have been made to the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies. GIS data shows that there are surface coal resources present in the western part of Nottingham City. The emerging Nottinghamshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework should define an appropriate Minerals Safeguarding Area, in line with the requirements of MPS1. The prior extraction of coal can, in some instances take place in advance of development within existing built-up areas - would request that in allocating any development or regeneration sites within the surface coal resource area to the west of the Nottingham area, the potential for prior extraction is considered.
- Site allocations should consider the presence of coal and mining legacy issues by using GIS layers previously provided but would not wish for any site to be excluded solely on grounds of coal mining hazards.
- The City of Nottingham had a growing reputation as an environmental city through its approach to issues such as public transport, energy, green technology business and Nottingham in Bloom. The current update to the Local Plan provides an opportunity to enhance this reputation further and put Nottingham on the map as a model city that embraces the concept of sustainability. Major European cities, such as Copenhagen and Hamburg are setting a benchmark for a modern, forward thinking and innovative approach to planning. This should be the vision for Nottingham, creating an environment that can adapt to climate change, where people want to live and work.
- The planning process needs to equip the City to face the challenges of at least the next 25 years. The key to environmental challenges that will face the City are:
 - Climate change adaptation and the need for urban cooling
 - Air quality and its impact on health
 - Recreation and sustainable transport options
 - Water quality and quantity including drainage
 - Wildlife and the role of the natural environment
- The planning process must enhance these issues and not exacerbate the problems or limit the opportunities to mitigate their impacts in the future.
- To work towards the challenges, the following policy measures are needed within the planning process. These are cross-cutting in their contribution to the challenges:
 - Protection for non-statutory sites
 - Accessible Natural Green space targets
 - Greening the built environment
 - Sustainable drainage systems
 - Creating green networks and corridors

- Greenbelt / brownfield
- Biodiversity offsetting / Community infrastructure levy
- Non-statutory Local Wildlife Sites (or Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation – SINC)s are essential to the future wellbeing of the City.
- Accessible Natural Greenspace Targets (ANGST) have now been established as a benchmark for urban greenspace. These highlight the minimum thresholds for greenspace to promote wellbeing.
- The built environment is an under-used resource to promote greater sustainability. Despite the technology having been in place for many years, some green features are still rarely incorporated. Such features have huge potential to promote recreation, biodiversity, drainage, insulation, pollution control etc.
- Preventing flash flooding, increasing urban cooling and holding water to maintain greenspace are all issues that will be essential for the future. SuDS can play a vital role in contributing to all these.
- The importance of green infrastructure means that this should be seen as a network rather than series of isolated sites. Additional benefit can result from this approach, with networks providing a range of benefits including green transport links alongside wildlife corridors or waterways.
- Bringing forward land for development is always going to be difficult. It is possible to have high quality development of greenbelt land that enhances the site for recreation or wildlife. Equally, many brownfield sites are important ecology because of the communities that have colonised.
- HSE does not comment on individual planning documents. LPAs are required to have regard to Article 12.1 of the Seveso Directive in formulating their general policies. Objectives of this are: to prevent major accidents and limit the consequences of such accidents for man and the environment. The need, in the long term to maintain appropriate distances between establishments and residential areas, areas of public use and areas of particular sensitivity or interest, and in the case of existing establishments for additional technical measures in accordance with Article 5 of the directive so as not to increase the risks to people.
- If there are major hazard sites and pipelines or associated consultation zones within the Plan area, it would be helpful to indicate to developers the constraints likely imposed by their presence.
- Major hazard sites should be shown on the Proposals Map, particularly routes for major hazard pipelines.
- Impact of urban/street design should be considered such as urban design to promote physical activity and policies to make land or urban spaces available for good growing as part of increasing local production of food in relation to the sustainability agenda.
- Issues around alcohol free zones and licensing should also be specifically referred to, and considerations for the further development of smoke free zones in open spaces.
- Expand on reference to 'necessary infrastructure' for example, reference should be made to the role of the walking and cycling network.
- Reference should be made to how PROW provide and opportunity for citizens to walk, cycles and ride.
- Insert reference to the Trent Valley Way PROW network which provided

access to the wider countryside. The River Leen offers an excellent opportunity to create a north-south traffic free route. The disused rail corridor adjacent to Hucknall Road carries a footpath.

- Disappointing the Council had considered getting rid of playgrounds and other open areas for housing when there are so many abandoned 'brownfield' sites in the City. Council should invoke powers to utilise unused properties.
- Assessment of other typologies that are needed in each area as identified in the Area Commentaries. Opportunity mapping should be undertaken for all open spaces. It should include opportunities raised by developments along the waterways e.g. provision of buffers, habitat enhancement.
- What happens if sites are proposed once LAPP DPD finished? At what stage is the allocation of the balance of open space network decided on mixed use sites? Need to consider procedure if a SINC was declared on a site approved for development. Identifying new open space creation to meet deficiencies in some areas, e.g. allotment to the north east?
- General scope will support the continued existence of allotments in Nottingham, and the only major development site to directly impact on current allotments is for Radford Bridge.
- Likely need for a new allotment site in the Bestwood area.
- Allotment Service has undertaken a major review of the service and allotment provision across the City, with proposals being incorporated into the draft Food Growing Framework.
- Protection should be given to the historic playing field at the former Greenholme School from development. The playing field has been in continuous use as sports land since 1885. It could satisfy the needs of local children, schools and many students who struggle to find anywhere to play sports and anyone else who values this open space at the heart of the built up area.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- A policy on minerals has been included within the Preferred Option.
- Minerals legacy has been taken into account in the site appraisals.
- Climate change and sustainability policies have been included within the Preferred Option.
- The policies map consultation document contains consultation zones for hazardous installations.
- Policies have been included within the Preferred Option regarding allotments, loss of open space, provision of open space, biodiversity and trees.
- A policy on high occupancy licensed premises and food and drink uses has been contained within the Preferred Option.
- Opportunity mapping has not yet been undertaken.
- Greenholme school playing pitches have been included in the updated open space network layer for consultation.

List of respondees:

Mrs Yousouf
Mr Harrison- The Coal Authority
Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mrs Randle
Mr James- Health and Safety Executive
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ms Moore- Nottingham Local Access Forum
Mr Oderemi
Ms Mee
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council
Mr Dawson

Chapter 8: Combating Climate Change Locally

Issue 8a: Decentralised Energy and Heat Networks

Q 8.1: Should we require developers to take the Nottingham City Council Decision Support Tool into consideration, when preparing development proposals?

- Such proposals should be able to demonstrate that overall emissions will be less than 50gCO₂/kWh, in line with Committee on Climate Change regulations. Biomass may not meet this requirement.
- It should not be assumed that CHP district heating will distribute efficiently.
- One respondent wished to make an active contribution through continued improvement of housing and maximising renewable energy generation.
- Climate change should not just rely on renewable and low carbon energy generation. The current Merton Rule is too blunt a tool and ignores building fabric/construction technique.
- No - this a matter for building regulations.
- No - the tools are untested and not validated, and will be overtaken as technological improvements advance.
- No - is designed to achieve a massive increase in incinerator capacity.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Use of the decision support tool is not a policy requirement.
- Policies on sustainable construction and district heating have been included in the Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Lee- Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Nottingham City Homes
Mr Giles
Mr Hartley- Lorne Estates Ltd
Mr Brearley- Sneinton Tenants and Residents Association

Q 8.2: Should we identify areas that are considered appropriate for renewable and low carbon energy and associated development?

- General support.
- An agreement over appropriate/inappropriate locations/zones for renewable and low carbon energy generation citywide would be useful.

- Essential that environmental bodies have the opportunity to provide input into the decision making process as some technologies/locations can be more damaging to wildlife/biodiversity than others.
- Developers should be able to invest in local energy projects to meet regulations.
- Yes to inform the local community of plans for the area.
- Production of low carbon energy and the 20% target detailed in paragraph 8.1 is supported.
- Importance of climate change and fuel poverty, having a responsibility (like other landlords) to help occupiers reduce their energy use is recognised.
- Climate change also impacts on property owners/occupants, with severe weather events increasing maintenance costs.
- No - this decodes as 'identifying sites for more and larger incinerators'.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Areas have not been identified in the Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Ms Jones Jenkins- Notts Wildlife Trust
 Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
 Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
 Mr Leslie MP
 Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
 Mr Chartery
 Mr Coleman
 Mr Freeman
 Mr Rapson
 Nottingham City Homes
 Ms Mee
 Mr Giles
 Mr Brearley- Sneinton Tenants and Residents Association

Q 8.3: Should we allocate sites for renewable energy generation? Are there any sites over 0.5ha you are aware of that may be suitable? If so, please fill in a separate consultation response form entitled 'Additional Sites'.

No comments received

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

N/A

List of respondees:

No comments were received for this question.

Issue 8b:Carbon Reduction

Q 8.4: Should we require developments to provide financial contributions towards identified local carbon reduction projects where it is not technically feasible to incorporate measures onsite prior to the introduction of Allowable Solutions?

- General support.
- Agrees but should not be used as an excuse for poor environmental practice.
- Developers should contribute to local carbon reduction projects (local authority and private), before and after 2016.
- Monitoring is important to ensure that the required carbon reduction is achieved.
- No - this would be unlawful and inappropriate, burdening development with more financial requirements, particularly for unproven projects which may be unrelated to the development in question.
- No - this potentially puts the City at a commercial disadvantage prior to 2016 requirements.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Not taken forward in the Preferred Option

List of respondees:

Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Lee- Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Mr Waumsley- Freeth Cartwright LLP
Ms Mee
Mr Giles
Mr Hartley- Lorne Estates Ltd

Q 8.5: Should the City Council develop a policy regarding Allowable Solutions to enable contributions to local projects from 2016? If so, what measures should be prioritised?

- Yes

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- A policy on Allowable Solutions has been included in the Preferred Option, although, no measures have been prioritised at this stage.

List of respondees:

Mr Giles

Issue 8c: Flood Risk**Q 8.6: Are there any additional Issues and Options that you consider relevant to combating climate change locally that have not been considered in this document?**

- Regard should be given to the historic environment in terms of energy efficiency and the impact of micro-generation equipment, along with the role that it can play in combating climate change.
- Tree planting should be ongoing and integral.
- Amenity/green spaces are important and should be retained with brown field sites considered for development.
- Allotments should be protected, allowing local people to grow their own food, reducing transport and subsequent environmental impacts.
- Supports sequential flood risk and SuDS, opportunities to maintain and restore biodiversity in river corridors should be considered;
- EA concerned about flood risk mitigation for sites along the River Leen corridor. If such sites are sequentially appropriate then requests a planning policy to holistically deal with flood risk issues (this may require contributions).
- A number of proposed allocations are close to permitted sites and the site allocation process should take account of these.
- There is little flood risk in Nottingham, the majority of the city being well protected or above flood risk level.
- Supports such approach due to evidence that moving to more renewable energy generation leads to more sustainable and healthy communities.
- One organisation confirmed it had its own carbon reduction targets and there may be opportunities to identify its sites for renewable energy generation.
- There should be reference to the benefits of open space in mitigating against impacts of climate change, and the importance of retaining/enhancing/creating wildlife areas to reduce impacts of climate change on wildlife. Central Government policy and guidance messages promote 'more, bigger, better, joined' ecological networks.
- Identify suitable wind turbine opportunity areas and develop the proposals model which assesses buffers etc.
- There is no 'need' to plan and deliver local renewable and low carbon energy.
- Schemes set out in Para 2.8 are not low carbon, should consider solar panels, wind turbines, ground-source heat pumps and purchasing 'green' energy from the National Grid i.e. those using wave, tide and hydrothermal technologies for example.
- The incinerator loses money, wastes heat that no-one wants and has an

adverse impact on Nottingham citizens. The existing AD plant near Daleside Road regularly emits odours to local residents.

- Where is Nottingham public's agreement for an energy facility and massive expansion of the incinerator?
- Energy from waste encourages 'wasteful energy', burning recyclable material.
- The Decision Support System and Energy City Tool are not required, designed to show demand for something that doesn't exist and not wanted in order to fund an expanded wasteful network. The Council's intervention is not required, residents and businesses are capable of organising solar panels, mini-turbines etc.
- The Council should encourage all development to use alternative technologies i.e. ground/air heat exchangers and solar before committing to anymore economically and environmentally expensive but ineffective overall wind turbines.
- Do not incinerate any more waste in Nottingham, this can lead to health and global warming problems.
- Waste streams should be separated and recycled.
- Dry Tomb Storage in former Nottinghamshire Colliery spoil heaps should be instigated as a reasonably safe long term method of waste disposal.
- Contaminated fly/bottom ash should not be used in construction.
- Anaerobic Digestion policy should be adopted.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Policies on the historic environment have been included in the Preferred Option.
- A policy on trees has been included in the Preferred Option.
- A policy on allotments has been included in the Preferred Option.
- A policy on SuDS has been included in the Preferred Option.
- Sequential flood risk approach has been included in policy in the Preferred Option and also in site assessments.
- Permitted sites have been considered in the allocation process.
- Waste policies are not considered in the LAPP DPD.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Leslie MP
Mr Lee Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Wilcox NHS Nottingham City
Ms Armstrong
Mr Chartery
Mr Coleman
Mr Freeman
Mr Rapson
Ms Mee
Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council
Mr Brearley Sneinton Tenants and Residents Association

Chapter 9: Well Connected Neighbourhoods

Issue 9a: Encouraging More Sustainable Travel

Q 9.1: Are there any sources of evidence or criteria which can be used to better inform the relative sustainability of the sites proposed for development in travel demand terms- if so what are they?

- Consideration should be given to the 'Watch out for Health' Checklist.
- Data sources should include Public Transport access/service information.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Comments noted

List of respondees:

Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Nottingham City Homes

Q 9.2: How can we best maximise the use of public transport, cycling and walking at the sites proposed for development?

- General support for sustainable transport modes.
- Importance of enabling sustainable transport and inclusive access in wider design of development stressed.
- Safety, quality of provision, as well as ongoing maintenance regarded as being important to success.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option incorporates policies to support sustainable transport measures such as cycling, walking and public transport and public transport interchanges.

List of respondees:

Mr McClintock- PEDALS
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Smith
Mr Wilcox- NHS Nottingham City
Ms Moore- Nottingham Local Access Forum

Nottingham City Homes
Mr Day- Nottingham City Council
Mr Giles
Ms Mossman & Ms Silver- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement

Q 9.3: Should we continue to require Travel Plans in line with the recognised guidance or are there local circumstances that indicate the need for different thresholds?

- Support for requirement for travel plans.
- Importance placed on the monitoring and enforcement processes in relation to Travel Plans.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option includes a policy requesting travel plans or transport statements to be submitted to support planning applications in line with the Department for Transport's best practice guidance set out in 'Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process' April 2009 and 'Guidance on Transport Assessments' or any subsequent locally derived standards.

List of respondees:

Mr McClintock- PEDALS
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mr Smith
Ms Armstrong
Nottingham City Homes
Mr Giles

Q 9.4: Should we require electric charging points for a range of development types, including commercial, institutional, leisure and residential?

- Supported

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Parking appendix supports provision of electric charging points in new developments.

List of respondees:

Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Giles

Issue 9b: Parking Standards

Q 9.5: Should we no longer require maximum car parking standards in relation to residential development and instead judge each application individually based upon the likely car ownership arising from the scheme and design issues?

- General support for assessing residential parking on the basis of the merits of individual schemes.
- Some support for retention of maximum standards for residential development.
- Potential increase in demand for on-street and off-street car parking spaces should be addressed in the Development Management process.
- Local level of public transport should be strongly influence the level of parking provision.
- Students living in a group of 6 in a family house generally have access to 3 permits or parking for 50% of residents. This should be applied to new purpose built.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Parking appendix provides a framework for assessing parking in developments based on the merits of individual schemes, taking local circumstances into account.
- Parking standards, including for residential development, retained to provide guidance for developers.

List of respondees:

Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Nottingham City Homes
Ms Mee
Mr Giles
Ms Mossman & Ms Silver- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement

Q 9.6: Should the number of bedrooms be a factor in determining the level of car parking for residential development?

- If developers in WPE were forced to make provision for parking based on the number of bedrooms in their HMO the parking problem would be a lot less severe.
- Insufficient car spaces can lead to on street parking impacting on walking routes.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The general approach proposed to assess parking for residential schemes is on the merits of the scheme, taking into account local circumstances, and this would allow for assessment in relation to numbers of bedrooms in proposed dwellings.

List of respondees:

Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Councillor Piper- Nottingham City Council
Councillor Fox- Nottingham City Council
Nottingham City Homes
Ms Mee
Mr Giles
Ms Mossman & Ms Silver- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement

Q 9.7: Should we continue to require maximum parking standards for non-residential development, based upon the criteria set out in Paragraph 9.9?

- General support that maximum parking standards for non-residential development should be retained.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Maximum standards to be retained in parking standards. These standards to be considered in conjunction with wider considerations, including local characteristics, in accordance with NPPF.

List of respondees:

Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Councillor Longford- Nottingham City Council
Ms Mee
Mr Day- Nottingham City Council
Mr Giles

Q 9.8: Are there any additional Issues and Options that you consider relevant to well connected neighbourhoods that have not been considered in this document?

- Production of Area Travel Plans associated with the development of new employment land sites in order to assist access whilst minimising adverse traffic impacts.

- Encouragement should be given towards sustainable travel from outside the City to Nottingham attractions.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Comments noted.

List of respondees:

Mr Walters- Highways Agency
Dr & Mrs Fletcher- Nottingham Action Group
Mrs Randle
Ms Moore- Nottingham Local Access Forum
Ms Cross
Ms Mee
Mr Buffery- Derbyshire County Council

Chapter 10: Infrastructure

Q 10.1: Do you have any comments on this section?

- The use of developer contributions to contribute towards the provision of open space, environmental enhancements and GI is supported.
- Contributions for the historic environment should be considered.
- Future development impacts on the strategic road network may require improvements which may need to be funded through developer contributions.
- Concern expressed that theatre buildings do not benefit appropriately under the terms of S106 and other agreements, and that it will increasingly be necessary to unlock new sources of funding to help pay for significant improvements to them.
- The waterways within Nottingham City (The River Trent and the Nottingham and Beeston Canal) which form part of the British Waterways network are infrastructure for which developer contributions (whether via S106 Obligations or through CIL charging) should be considered, and that they should be specifically identified as such in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- Affordable Housing represents a subsidy for some on a housing development paid for by their neighbours.
- Items mentioned in paragraph 10.5 are items which the community as a whole should pay for through the Council Tax system. By requiring new developments to shoulder these costs makes the houses less affordable and is hardly fair.

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option version of the LAPP contains a Developer Contributions Policy in which open space, affordable housing, heritage protection, transport, community and cultural facilities are specifically mentioned.

List of respondees:

Ms Newman- Natural England - Nottinghamshire and Lowland Derbyshire
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Walters- Highways Agency
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Ms Freeman- The Theatres Trust
Mr Dickinson- Canals & River Trust
Mr Foster
Ms Mossman & Ms Silver- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement

Appendix 2 – Comments received at the Issues and Options Consultation Stage on Development Sites

DS1 Belgrave Road / Linnington Road

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="969 363 1503 395">• The use is considered satisfactory | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="1664 363 2112 427">• Development would require Environmental assessment.<li data-bbox="1664 443 2085 651">• Concern that industrial development on the site would exacerbate existing loss of light and noise nuisance to nearby residential. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Following further assessment, this site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. Please refer to the accompanying Site Appraisal document for a more detailed explanation of this decision.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Smith
Mr Burton

DS2 Bestwood Day Centre

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western part of site located in area of flood risk. Council will need to undertake a flood risk sequential test • Any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. • Surface water run-off generated by new development should be restricted to greenfield rates and utilise Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- An individual site assessment has been undertaken
- Flood risk and contamination issues have been considered in the assessment
- Development principles reflect flood risk and contamination issues

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency

DS3 Bestwood Sidings

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|----------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site should be left as an open space | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Design should take into account Environment Agency access requirements.• Nottingham City Council must undertake a flood risk Sequential Test |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Following further assessment, this site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. Please refer to the accompanying Site Appraisal document for a more detailed explanation of this decision.

List of respondees:

**Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Martin Smith**

DS4 Blenheim Lane Site

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|----------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development should be directed to Brownfield sites. Proposal would create loss of trees, buildings and affect local community who work on the site. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Careful consideration required to the types of potential energy production given the site• Site is adjacent to a former landfill site. Environmental Assessment is required. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option'.
- The preferred option document includes a policy providing appropriate protection for existing trees.
- Development Management Policy included within document concerning sustainable energy policies and exploitation of localised energy networks.

List of respondees:

**Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Dr Clare**

DS5 Henry Mellish Main School Site

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Concern that development on this site would be a detriment, introducing more traffic noise into the area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Preference expressed for existing open space to remain so.Preservation of the building frontage on Hucknall Lane would be welcomed |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option'.
- Site boundary has been revised following response to consultation and now omits open space element from proposed allocation.
- Preferred Option document includes policy designed to ensure detrimental impact to amenity from noise does not arise as a result of development.

List of respondees:

**Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Carpenter
Councillor Norris - Old Highbury Vale Tenants and Residents Association**

DS6 Linby Street/Filey Street

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use supported as long as boundaries and site accesses are respected. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site is located in an area of high flood risk. It will be extremely challenging to manage flood risk on-site without increasing flood risk elsewhere• Environmental Assessment require assessing potential for contamination to groundwater resource. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option'. An individual site assessment has been undertaken
- Flood risk and contamination issues have been considered in the assessment
- Development principles reflect flood risk and contamination issues

List of respondees:

**Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Heath**

DS7 Stanton Tip

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This should remain an enhanced open space and as it is a sinc protected as such for future generations | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principal landowner supports mixed use allocation subject to the mix being housing led/funded, alongside other subordinate uses. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ideally see the site retained as biodiversity resource.• Should it prove necessary or advisable to develop, partial development only should take place to retain the SINC areas.• If necessary to allocate this site for development every effort must be made to retain the SINCs on the periphery of the site and incorporate them into the GI for the development• Development must be of right density for design and surrounding environment |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | considerations. Current access into site unsuitable and would result in detriment to neighbours. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option' for a mix of uses, predominantly housing.
- Protection of SINC area identified in development principles
- The Preferred Option development principles for the site take on board the concern re the loss of open space

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Strawsons Holdings Ltd
Ms Jones Jenkins - Notts Wildlife Trust
Mrs Richards
Mr Martin Smith

DS8 Hucknall Road/Southglade Road (Southglade Food Park)

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| • | • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact upon Local Nature reserve should be considered. • Consideration of an environmental impact |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>needed in relation to potential pollution to groundwater resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern of impact of development on nearby solar panels. • Concern about noise and fumes nuisance from proposed development on site |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option'
- Development principles reflect need for environmental assessment prior to development.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Ms Jones Jenkins - Notts Wildlife Trust
Mr Jackson
Ms Lawry
Mr Lawry

DS9 Bar Lane Industrial Park

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would increase noise and traffic | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is underlain by a |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If development is high, it could be unsightly | | Principal Aquifer and there is potential to pollute groundwater |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development would impact on wildlife. Understand that site is in Green Belt and cannot be built on. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Following further assessment, this site is not a Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mrs Bellaby
Mr & Mrs Ignatowicz

DS10 Basford Gasworks

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to contaminate groundwater Prior written consent required as site is close to River Leen |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New flood risk information available. Site is at high risk of flooding • Flood risk sequential test should be undertaken • Surface water runoff should be restricted to greenfield runoff rates |
| • | • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend boundary to reflect plan provided • Proposed employment allocation too restrictive • Mixed use is most appropriate allocation |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- An individual site assessment has been undertaken
- Boundary has been amended
- Uses have been amended

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Horsley -Mar City Developments Ltd

DS11 Basford Gateway

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long established printers has traded from the location since the 1990s. Owns freehold and no intention to sell. • Expansion of retail and residential would likely exacerbate traffic problems in the area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council proposition is supported | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk sequential test should be undertaken • Surface water runoff should be restricted to greenfield runoff rates • Potential to contaminate groundwater • Prior written consent required as site is close to River Leen • Site is in an area of medium flood risk • Potential allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer • There is a Waste Transfer Station on site |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed boundary would seriously affect access to and from the businesses at Vernon Park Trading Estate. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed allocation, as shown, would remove a vital link road to and from Southwark Street • Whole area falls into 1 in 100 year flood plain and development could not take place without River Leen development further down steam of this and the proposed site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- This site has not been taken forward as a Preferred Option, given its active use and current ownership.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Simpson -Russell Press Limited
Mr Powell -Nottingham Platers Ltd
Councillor Norris -Old Highbury Vale Tenants & Residents Association
Mr Humphries -Nottingham Platers

DS12 Church View Industrial Estate

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|---|
| • | • | • Adjacent to a Grade II* Listed Building. There is potential for allocation to improve the setting but also equal risk that it will harm it. Development criteria should refer to preserving and enhancing the setting of the listed church. |
| • | • | • River Leen runs in a culvert through the site. This should be opened up where possible. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Written consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top of bank.• Site is in area of high flood risk (zone 3).• A sequential test should be undertaken.• Safe access and escape from the site will be required and depths and velocities of floodwater should be considered.• Surface water run-off should be restricted to greenfield rated and should utilise SuDS• Site is underlain by Principal Aquifer and there is potential for development to cause pollution of the groundwater.• There is an End of Life Vehicle Yard adjacent to the site and consideration should be given to potential impacts from redevelopment |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- This site has not been taken forward as a Preferred Option, due to its active employment use and high level of flood risk. Location is also not sequentially preferable for retail.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge - English Heritage (East Midlands)

DS13 Johnsons Dyeworks

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are current flood problems in the area, affecting properties with cellars. Flooding issue will only get worse for existing and future owners if land is developed. • Land is contaminated • Noise pollution will arise from the redevelopment. • There is wildlife in the area that would be killed • Affordable housing will increase crime in the area. • Development would create a huge housing estate from Arnold to the ring road. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council proposition is supported. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely challenging to manage flood risk on this site without increasing flood risk elsewhere. • This potential site allocation is located immediately adjacent to the Day Brook, which is designated as a Main River. This means that prior written consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>of bank. It may be a requirement for the 8 metre strip to be kept free of built development in order to safeguard access to the River Leen for essential maintenance and flood risk management work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parts of the site start to flood in a 1 in 10 year event. This places parts of the site within the functional floodplain (Zone 3b) which is afforded the highest levels of protection against development.• Careful consideration will need to be given to this latest flood modelling in a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment.• A sequential test should be undertaken.• Safe access and escape from the site will be required and depths and velocities of floodwater should be considered.• Surface water run-off should |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>be restricted to greenfield rated and should utilise SuDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is underlain by Principal Aquifer and there is potential for development to cause pollution of the groundwater. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new residential / retail site at this location could create several negative issues for current home owners at Fox Grove and could be detrimental to the value and current function of properties in the area. • Building in the area could create the following problems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decreased current function of properties backing onto the proposed site (i.e. odd numbered houses on Fox Grove) by the removal of privacy of back garden areas. • Increased risk of break-ins and theft via backs of properties at Fox Grove • Greater traffic volume at Nottingham Road / Valley Road junction. • Decreased safety along Fox Grove due to greater traffic volume through side streets, sue to traffic avoiding traffic-jams at Valley Road junction. • Bought property as it was quiet and not overlooked. If building work is undertaken it | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could this be an opportunity to sort out existing flood problems, including the flooding of basements on Fox Road? • Could the development provide a small community centre for children to play off the streets after school? |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>will lead to overlooking. This will remove privacy and increase risk of break-ins.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More residential and retail sites in the area will come at a greater volume of traffic through the already narrow streets and side streets. There are already issues with traffic at several times of the day at the Nottingham / Valley Road junction, with the bottle-neck of traffic creating long jams and delays from the mini-roundabout to Valley Road. More traffic will only create more problems and greater delays for residents in the area and traffic may cut through side streets. • Children currently use the side roads for games and there could be safety issues from additional traffic. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to clarify what land is being built on and when development is going to take place. • Concerns over ownership of the land. Disputed over who owns part of site. No development should happen on land that is owned by consultee. It is too small for development and too close to stream. • Problems with vandalism on the land. • Trees on land are supposed to be maintained by owner but this is not happening and is causing damage. Trees have caused damage to house. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct parking spaces within the new are to | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>reflect modern trends and prevent parking in existing areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision for construction vehicles to have access from Vernon Road / Basford Works to protect amenity of existing residents. The access to the completed development should also be from this point. | | |
|---|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Comments noted
- An individual site assessment has been undertaken
- Flood risk and contamination issues have been considered in the assessment
- Development principles reflect flood risk and contamination issues

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Ms Avery
Ms Bonsor
Miss Maltby
Mr Moon
Councillor Norris Old Highbury Vale Tenants & Residents Association

DS14 Western Boulevard

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|------------------|
|--------|---------|------------------|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should remain as allotments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and there is potential to cause pollution due to previous uses • Site is located in an area of high flood risk |
|--|---|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Comments noted.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Smith

DS15 Western Section of Former Dunn Line Coach Station

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and there is potential for development to cause pollution, given former uses. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Comments noted.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency

DS16 Chronos Richardson

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and there are records of contamination associated with some parts of the site from the former use of the land. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Comments noted

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency

DS17 Former Eastglade Primary and Nursery School

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site should not have a factory on it and should be used for elderly peoples accommodation. The Children’s Home near by should be included in the allocation | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Residential use supported but layout should not encourage criminal activity | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no particular environmental constraints impacting upon this site. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concerns over lack of allotments across the City• Concerns over SINC status and potential impact of development on protected species• Concerns boundary is artificial and is damaging to local wildlife• Concerns allocation would conflict with need to protect open space – believes planning department has long recognised area as ‘precious’ and should not be lost as open space• Suggests independent year round survey of site’s flora and fauna before any planning application is considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are a lot of shopping facilities in the Top Valley area. There should be enough shops where people live. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contends that flooding is already a problem in the area and will be exacerbated by further development. • Concerns over population overcrowding in area and impact on schools, local services and traffic congestion. • Opposes housing target and provision of extra housing. • Suggests filling empty homes and using brownfield land availability in the vicinity. | | |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Constraints have been looked at as part of the detailed site assessment. Site has been taken forward as a Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mrs Lee
Mrs Mostyn
Mr Jones
Mrs Jones

DS18 Former Padstow School

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| • | • | • Area is adjacent to a SINC |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | and incorporates established open space. In order to protect the SINC, it should be incorporated into a much larger GI provision which also incorporated the existing open space. Management agreements should be secured to ensure that the SINC and areas surrounding it are managed to enhance their ecological value to protect and enhance the SINC. |
| • | • | • No particular environmental constraints within remit impacting upon site |
| • | • | • Links to Southglade Park and DS19 also needed |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Constraints have been looked at as part of the detailed site assessment. Site has been taken forward as a Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

**Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Ms Jones Jenkins - Notts Wildlife Trust
Mr Smith**

DS19 Former Padstow School Detached Playing Field (Beckhampton Road)

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wants clarification of the proposals relating to the site, e.g. the form of development. Recently bought a house on the basis the land was open.• No need for shops as large Tesco close by and small precinct 100 yards away.• Also a recent retail development near Tesco that has remained empty over last 2 years.• There is no safe parking along a very busy stretch of road like Beckhampton. It would be more beneficial to safety of road users and pedestrians if there was an access road by the community centre and some parking along the back of the houses for use by residents.• Something needs to be done about the parking in the area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site should be a Preferred Option | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would like the Council to consider this site as well as the former Haywood School playing field on Beckhampton Road and Hazel Hills residential home site on Beckampton Road for possible extra care/elderly persons accommodation in the ward. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• With the exception of 'Sandy Banks' this is the only open space left on the Bestwood Park | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No particular environmental constraints within remit |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Estate. The area is used extensively in the summer by local children. Also used year round by dog walkers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building work will cause considerable congestion on Beckhampton Road. • Bestwood Park Estate was finished in the 1960s and there is no need / no room for additional residential / retail units. Area was designed to incorporate green open spaces, as opposed to the claustrophobic back to back housing of areas like old Meadows. | | <p>impacting upon site</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCC is intent on building on any patch of green open space left on this estate. • Site should not be a preferred option. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about building on field adjacent to house. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Constraints have been looked at as part of the detailed site assessment. Site has been taken forward as a Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Ms May Nottingham City Council
Mr Bailey
Mr Hardy
Ms Horton

DS20 Former Padstow School Detached Playing Field (Ridgeway)

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that development of this site would mean that a grassed play and sports area for the children and nursery at Southglade school could not be provided. Concerned over traffic - current problems due to Bestwood park community centre. If there are too many cars parked, residents cars have to be parked further from houses which is problematic due to arthritis. A car park at the back of the field could rectify this. A service road could be built to accommodate the cars that are parked on Beckhampton road by the residents could then be accessed at the back of the buildings. Does not agree with the proposed uses - don't need any more retail as shops standing empty on Beckhampton Road and there is a Tesco Extra at the bottom of Ridgeway Road. • There are also several empty industrial units in the area. Therefore the open space should be retained for the school children for their fitness and welfare. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No particular environmental constraints within remit impacting upon site |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly disagree on the proposed plan to build on the school field behind my Cleaning house for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. area already built up enough b. Not enough green belt for children to play on as it is | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>c. you want to build on field but cannot cross green in front of house for drive way because you said your preserving green belt in this area.</p> | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the site would have a serious impact on the community. It is used by the local school for events such as sports day and fund raising. It is also used every Saturday and Sunday by several groups of local people for sports - football, jogging etc. • Many locals use it to take their children or grandchildren out to play and it is also used by many as a safe and clean place to walk pets. • Concerned of negative impacts on Children's learning environments. Noise could have a negative impact. • Residents whose homes back onto the field have raised overcrowding concerns. • Also concerns about pressures on local services and facilities. Concerns about increase in traffic due to air and noise pollution and safety. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Constraints have been looked at as part of the detailed site assessment. Site has been taken forward as a Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Shardlow
Mr Fawsitt
DP Window Cleaning

DS21 Haywood Detached Playing Field

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Disappointing to hear of proposals to build on green areas, even with housing shortages and the job opportunities that it may create.• Field should not be developed, as it is used by primary school children.• Access to green space is imperative due to current obesity crisis.• Lack of green space could lead to children hanging around on street corners.• Building on field will create more traffic and will detract from the area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No particular environmental constraints within remit impacting upon site |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Bestwood estate is residence to thousands of people. It is a very densely populated estate and already suffers from issues that are commonly associated with such areas- crime, traffic, unemployment and poor social mobility. Adding housing, which will most likely be at the | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Large proportion should be retained as open space. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>'affordable' end of the scale, at DS21 will serve only to worsen the situation raising the issues facing the Bestwood estate to a chronic level.</p> | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thousands of people leave this estate each day to travel to work and this plan would add to this creating more traffic, pollution and also adding to the risk that children of Robin Hood already face each morning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary does not provide access to the site. The site appears unsuitable for residential development as it is at the top of a steep slope. Difficult to see how access for contractors / domestic vehicles could be accommodated unless they come through the Beckhampton Centre carpark, which can only be accessed via a narrow slip road The site is well used by the local community during the day, evenings and weekends. Also used by the Beckhampton Centre with students for PE in the summer. Land would be missed by the local community. Consideration would need to be given as to how the Beckhampton Centre would function during both the construction and operational phases. Aware this is not a planning application, but someone at the City Council would need to address where the Beckhampton Centre would be relocated before the plans were submitted. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Facility is an education centre for vulnerable young people of school age (pregnant and young mums) with babies on site and it would not be able to teach here alongside this work. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have lived in house since 1962 and appreciate location adjacent to playing pitch, which is rich in wildlife. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Constraints have been looked at as part of the detailed site assessment. Site has been taken forward as a Preferred Option.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Smith
Mr Border
Ms Jeffery
Mr Bargewell Giant Uk Ltd
Ms Mindel
Mr Selke
Mrs Simpkin

DS22 Chingford Road Playing Field

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main response was concern at loss of open | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Environment Agency |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> space by 3 local resident St Martin's Assoc. of Residents and Tenants Against development, but if development is to take place then would like to be involved in detailed discussion | | <p>stated that there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A toolkit has been run for this site |
| • | • | • |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option development principles for the site take on board the concern re the loss of open space. However, initial screening has shown that the site is not located in an area of sports pitch deficiency.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency

Mr Hose

Mrs Herring

Mr & Mrs Hill

Ms Atkin -Nottingham City Council

Ms Hilton

Mr West -St Martin's Association of Residents and Tenants

DS23 Melbury School Playing Field

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|----------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Environment Agency stated that there are no |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A toolkit has been run for this site |
| • | • | • |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Initial screening has shown that the site is not located in an area of sports pitch deficiency.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Ms Atkin - Nottingham City Council

DS24 Nottingham Business Park North

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern from English Heritage re impact on Strelley village | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson Bowden : Boundary should reflect attached Map | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Agency stated that there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Northern site is some distance away from Strelley Village

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council

DS25 Nottingham Business Park South - Developer Option

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern from English Heritage re impact on Strelley village | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson Bowden developers support this site for development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency state that their records show there is a former mine shaft on-site and there is the potential for contamination associated with mining. Development on this site will require careful consideration and environmental | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Following further assessment, this site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. Please refer to the accompanying Site Appraisal document for a more detailed explanation of this decision, which is mainly due to Green Belt and conservation concerns.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Smith
Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council

DS26 Nottingham Business Park South - Existing Allocation

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern from English Heritage re impact on Strelley village | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson Bowden developers support this site for development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency state that their records show there is a former mine shaft on-site and there is the potential for contamination associated with mining. Development on this site will require careful consideration and environmental | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Development principles have been produced which reflect the conservation concerns.

- Woodhouse Park (formerly known as Nottingham Business Park South) is to be put forward for mainly residential

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council

DS27 The Denewood Centre

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several responses inc from Brocklewood schools and Highwood Player & Infant and Nursery School against development of school playing fields | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Agency stated that there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option in the LAPP takes forward some of this site but the site has been reduced so as not to include the playing fields

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Ms Tarrant Brocklewood Junior School
Ms Potter Brocklewood Infant And Nursery School
Miss Goddard
Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council
Mr Morley Highwood Player Infant and Nursery School
Highwood Player Junior School

DS28 Bobbers Mill Industrial Estate

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Environment Agency indicate that it is extremely challenging to manage flood risk on-site without increasing flood risk elsewhere. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">A representation stated that the site should be allocated as a superstore to serve the Western Estates | <ul style="list-style-type: none">A representation stated that Site boundary should be widened |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Local resident: against development at the back of their gardenCity Council biodiversity officer stated that River Leen SINC goes through centre | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The development principles reflect the Environment Agency's concerns.
- The site boundary has been redrawn to reflect the concern of the local resident. An additional site has been included for consultation rather than wider boundary
- It is not considered that this site is appropriate to be allocated as a superstore to serve the Western Estates

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Foster
Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council
Ms Ebrall
Mr Greene John Cawley Ltd

DS29 Chalfont Drive

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Several local residents concerned at the scale of development proposed and the row of trees along Robins Wood Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Environment Agency stated that there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The site already has planning permission.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Mr Slatford
Revd & Mrs Ward
Mrs White
Ms Ball

Mr Turner

DS30 South of Former Co-op Dairy

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern from Notts Wildlife Trust and City Council biodiversity officer re possible impact on Robin's Wood - City Council biodiversity officer suggest a buffer• This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and we hold records of contamination associated with some parts of the site from the former uses of the land as a dairy. Development on this site has the potential to cause pollution to the groundwater resource and will require careful consideration and environmental assessment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The development principles for the site in the Preferred Option of the LAPP take on board the concerns raised

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain -Environment Agency
Ms Jones Jenkins -Notts Wildlife Trust
Ms Atkin - Nottingham City Council

DS31 Speedo Site

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency state this site is located in an area of high flood risk | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City Council biodiversity officer stated that there should be a buffer between the site and the nearby allotments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The development principles for the site in the Preferred Option of the LAPP reflect the Environment Agency’s and Biodiversity officers concerns

| |
|---|
| <p>List of respondees:</p> <p>Mr Hussain -Environment Agency Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council</p> |
|---|

DS32 Ellis and Everard, Hadyn Road

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overlooking concerns due to higher ground level of site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underlain by a Principal Aquifer; Records of site |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>contamination from former uses, development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-operational scrap metal yard on-site, if redeveloped for a different purpose the Environmental Permit must be surrendered. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option incorporates general design and amenity policies where concerns regarding potential for overlooking from new development could be addressed.
- The administration of environmental permits is a matter for the Environment Agency, and is outside of the remit of the LAPP document.
- The potential for contamination from development would be considered, amongst other issues, as part of the planning application process.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain (Environment Agency)
Mr & Mrs P Bailey

DS33 Lortas Road

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opposed to new housing due to increased traffic problems and lack of existing green spaces in the area;• Should be retained as green space for recreation and wildlife purposes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No particular environmental site constraints;• OSN toolkit complete |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Likely impact upon local traffic and highway conditions from proposed developments would be assessed as part of the Development Management planning application process.

List of respondees:

Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)
Ms Felicity Atkin (Open Space & Biodiversity Officer - Nottingham City Council)
Mr C Gillet
Miss Rosi Jarvis
Mrs Jane Balfe

DS34 Forest Mill

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Heritage advises further site assessment/justification necessary to take forward as an allocation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-designate as employment and family housing; A derelict site and a blight locally, suggests elements of residential use for families; Redevelopment would be a regeneration catalyst for the wider area, providing investment and jobs. Mixed use allocation would be supported, development should be retail led providing a modern focus to the Alfreton Road Local Centre; Thackeray Street and the Club One property should be developed in a complimentary and comprehensive manner A redevelopment that could re-use some of the historical parts of the building would be welcome. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No employment uses near to existing Boden Street housing; Within the Gamble Street and Alfreton Road Conservation Area, redevelopment should be sensitive to the historic environment and retaining existing buildings considered; Underlain by a Principal Aquifer; Development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Conservation area status does not preclude development and the Council will consider whether applications preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gamble Street and Alfreton Road Conservation Area. Applications received would consider the development's impact on the surrounding area, environment and neighbouring properties.

- The potential for contamination from development would be considered, amongst other issues, as part of the planning application process.

List of respondees:

Councillor Aslam Nottingham City Council
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge (English Heritage - East Midlands)
Mr Hussain (Environment Agency)
Mrs Rose
Maryland Security
Councillor Williams Nottingham City Council
Councillor Ali Nottingham City Council
Nottingham Action group on HMOs

DS35 People's College

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site, given its close proximity to the historic Nottingham Castle site, would not be suitable for this type of accommodation as it would not maximise the economic development potential of the site in a way that a use more clearly linked to the location of this site would. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central location, suggests housing for those over 60 years old, there's no requirement for more office space; • Previously established principles for the college site should be incorporated into the wider site redevelopment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in a highly sensitive position next to Nottingham Castle (Grade 1 listed and a scheduled monument), surrounded by conservation areas. • English Heritage has no objection subject to sensitive redevelopment, recommends site allocation |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>to include a development brief requirement;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive redevelopment may not allow for some types of residential development i.e. student accommodation. • No particular environmental site constraints; • It is of concern that the map in Appendix 2, under the 'Potential Constraints' heading, does not note the close proximity to a considerable number of listed buildings. Neither does it mention the site is fringed by at least three conservation areas, reinforcing the significance of the location. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The college's planning permission should allow the principles of the planning permission particularly the massing and scale to be maintained in the future
- The development principles for the site and the Castle Quarter policy reflect concerns about the setting.
- The site will be allocated for an appropriate variety of uses, it is not considered appropriate at this location to restrict the type of residential use.

List of respondees:

Mr Tom Gilbert (English Heritage - East Midlands)
Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)
Mr Chris Leslie MP
Mr David Devlin
South Nottingham College
Nottingham Action Group on HMOs

DS36 Radford Mill

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">English Heritage advise some buildings have heritage value (possibly being regarded as locally significant heritage assets), further site assessment/justification necessary to take forward as an allocation, suggests considering retention of some existing buildings; | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Re-designate as employment and family housing;In order to create a viable plan that would permit the retention of the buildings, conversion of all, or parts, to residential accommodation may result in a satisfactory outcome. This might include the option of conversion to accommodation for students or other groups with similar requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none">No employment uses near to existing Boden Street housing;Underlain by a Principal Aquifer;Development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The development principles reflect the concerns about heritage of the buildings

- The site will be allocated for an appropriate use, it is not considered appropriate at this location to specify an amount of employment development as this may lead to the long awaited redevelopment not coming forward, though it is likely that the Council would welcome some employment development on the site.

List of respondees:

Councillor Aslam Nottingham City Council
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Councillor Williams Nottingham City Council
Councillor Ali Nottingham City Council
Nottingham Action Group for HMOs

DS37 Sandfield Centre

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-designate as educational use - Hyson Green/Forest Fields lacks school places and has rising numbers of school-age children; • Welcomes a mix of housing type to include garages and sheltered accommodation, allowing residents to stay in the area; • The nursery should be retained. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages acquisition of Greenholme Playing for associated school; • Underlain by a Principal Aquifer; • Development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SINC to the south (Lenton Methodist Church Walls); |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Sandfield Centre has been declared surplus requirements and is vacant. It is not considered that the site is required for educational purposes and will be allocated for an appropriate use
- The potential for contamination from development would be considered, amongst other issues, as part of the planning application process.

List of respondees:

Councillor Aslam Nottingham City Council
Mr Leslie MP
Mrs Rose
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Councillor Williams Nottingham City Council
Councillor Ali Nottingham City Council
Ms Nix
Mr Marks
Mrs Lynch
Mr Marks
Mr & Mrs Duffield
Mr & Mrs Wilson
Mrs Booth
Mr and Mrs Seaton

Mr Seaton
Mrs Humphrey
Ms Atkin **Nottingham City Council**
Mr Champion
Ms Hanif
Mr Hatton
Mrs Clarke
Mr Caldwell
Nottingham Action Group for HMOs

DS38 Hine Hall

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entire site is a designated conservation area. Further assessment and justification of this site would be necessary in order to take it forward as an allocation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be included in the Open Space Network |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on surrounding views identified in previous development schemes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Conservation area status does not preclude development and the Council will consider whether applications preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hine Hall Conservation Area. Applications received would consider the development's impact on the surrounding area, environment and neighbouring properties.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Hussain- Environment Agency
Mr Smith
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council
Mr Hughes

DS39 Springfield, Alexandra Park

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would welcome Residential Development and park amenity land but there are problems with access. Informed by builders that it would require a new road which would add to expense. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Character of existing conservation area and Grade II* registered park and gardens should be preserved which may require further assessment and justification of this site. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- When considering applications in Conservation Areas the council will seek to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area
- Any such residential scheme would take into account access issues and only be approved where issues are resolved.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge- English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mrs Silvester- Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr & Mrs Palmer- Elliott Durham Action Zone
Mr Hussain- Environment Agency
Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council

DS40 Former Haywood School Site

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Residential would create serious traffic congestion in an already busy area. Open Space would be preferred for community and local wildlife | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Comments largely supportive with caveats relating to concerns about access from inappropriate cul-de-sac locations nearby. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">No objection to low density housing but consideration required for mature trees, which need to be protected | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Environmental and other issues would be addressed when any specific application for development is submitted.
- Access issues would be addressed when any specific application for development is submitted but comment on the nature of appropriate access noted.
- Consider allocating proposed use of part of site to Open Space.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain- Environment Agency

Mr Smith

Mr Henshaw

Mr & Mrs Marquis

Mr Weekes

Ms Atkin- Nottingham City Council

Ms King

Ms Pattman

Ms Spiteri

Ms Scull

DS41 Sherwood Library

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern that site would attract a large food retailer that is undesirable in the locale due to impact on local shops | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider Residential Use combined with Community Facilities too. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern at loss of library | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern at loss of open space to the rear of library site | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern at loss of free parking and impact on local businesses and synagogue | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Any application received for the site would have its impact on the surrounding area and businesses assessed. Retention of a library in the local centre area could be included.
- Alternative Residential and Community Use noted - consider changing/adding proposed uses
- Consider potential for including library provision in any redevelopment

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain- Environment Agency
Ms Ainley
Ms Denholm
Mr Edwards- Sweet Tastic
Mr Birch- Spencer Birch
Mr Selke

DS42 Eastside - Bus Depots

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential heritage assists and in conservation area, further site assessment/justification necessary to take forward as an allocation; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop as a 5* hotel, bridge linked to the National Ice Centre to create a low cost convention/conference facility - financial viability details of such a proposal are available; • The National Ice Centre recommends additional parking provision as part of mixed use site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus depot has good character, fits in the streetscene and could be reused (suggests retail or retain bus depot use); • EA recommends consulting the Environmental Health Officer regarding this site |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>allocation due to proximity of Eastcroft Waste Facility as development could impact on its chimney's dispersion characteristics - this may require introducing a new sensitive receptor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underlain by a Principal Aquifer; • Records of site contamination from former bus depot use, development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment; • Site abuts, but is outside of a flood zone. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The development principles for the site reflect concerns about the relationship/impact on adjoining Sneinton Market Conservation Area.
- The development principles take on board the comments made by the Environment Agency
- The site will be allocated for an appropriate variety of uses, this could include a 5* hotel or convention/conference facility

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mrs Silvester Nottingham Civic Society / Thorneywood Residents Association
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Huckstep National Ice Centre & Capital FM Arena Nottingham

DS43 Eastside - Pennyfoot Street

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• EA recommends consulting the Environmental Health Officer regarding this site allocation due to proximity of Eastcroft Waste Facility as development could impact on its chimney's dispersion characteristics - this may require introducing a new sensitive receptor;• Underlain by a Principal Aquifer;• Records of site contamination from former uses, development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- This site is not being taken forward as a Preferred Option as the majority of the site has been developed and the remained of the site is too small for allocation (i.e. it is below the 0.5ha threshold).

List of respondees:

Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)

DS44 Waterside - British Waterways Owned Part of Freeth Street Site

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| • | • | • EA recommends consulting the Environmental Health Officer regarding this site allocation due to proximity of Eastcroft Waste Facility as development could |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>impact on its chimney's dispersion characteristics - this may require introducing a new sensitive receptor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Located adjacent River Trent and prior written consent required from EA for works 8m from top of bank. An 8m strip, kept free, may be required for essential maintenance/flood risk management and should be considered;• Located in a flood zone, Sequential Test therefore required;• Advise site specific FRA as site does not benefit from any formal flood defences;• Underlain by a Principal Aquifer;• Development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- This site is to be combined with DS46 (Waterside Freeth Street) in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP. The following range of uses are put forward as the Preferred Option on the site: residential, office, small scale convenience retail and restaurant/café.
- The Environment Agency comments are taken into account in the Development Principles for this Land Allocation in the Preferred Option particularly regarding flood risk and proximity to the Eastcroft Energy from Waste Facility.

List of respondees:

Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)

DS45 Waterside – Eastpoint

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EA recommends consulting the Environmental Health Officer regarding this site allocation due to proximity of Eastcroft Waste Facility as development could impact on its chimney's dispersion characteristics - |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>this may require introducing a new sensitive receptor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underlain by a Principal Aquifer; • Development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Environment Agency’s comments have been stated in the Development Principles for this Land Allocation in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP.

| |
|--|
| <p>List of respondees:</p> <p>Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)</p> |
|--|

DS46 Waterside - Freeth Street

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|----------------------------|
| • | • | • EA recommends consulting |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>the Environmental Health Officer regarding this site allocation due to proximity of Eastcroft Waste Facility as development could impact on its chimney's dispersion characteristics - this may require introducing a new sensitive receptor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Located adjacent River Trent and prior written consent required from EA for works 8m from top of bank. An 8m strip, kept free, may be required for essential maintenance/flood risk management and should be considered;• Located in a flood zone, Sequential Test therefore required;• Advise site specific FRA as site does not benefit from any formal flood defences;• Underlain by a Principal Aquifer;• Development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If developed, existing Waste Transfer Station permit will need surrendering. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Environment Agency’s comments have been stated in the Development Principles for this Land Allocation in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP.

| |
|--|
| <p>List of respondees:</p> <p>Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)</p> |
|--|

DS47 Waterside - Park Yacht Club

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EA recommends consulting the Environmental Health Officer regarding this site allocation due to proximity |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>of Eastcroft Waste Facility as development could impact on its chimney's dispersion characteristics - this may require introducing a new sensitive receptor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Located adjacent River Trent and prior written consent required from EA for works 8m from top of bank. An 8m strip, kept free, may be required for essential maintenance/flood risk management and should be considered;• Located in a flood zone, Sequential Test therefore required;• Advise site specific FRA as site does not benefit from any formal flood defences;• Underlain by a Secondary Aquifer;• Records of contamination on parts of site, development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | consideration and Environmental Assessment. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Environment Agency’s comments have been stated in the Development Principles for this Land Allocation in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP.

List of respondees:

Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)

DS48 Waterside - Trent Lane Basin

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| • | • | • EA recommends consulting the Environmental Health Officer regarding this site allocation due to proximity of Eastcroft Waste Facility as development could impact on its chimney's dispersion characteristics - |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>this may require introducing a new sensitive receptor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Located adjacent River Trent and prior written consent required from EA for works 8m from top of bank. An 8m strip, kept free, may be required for essential maintenance/flood risk management and should be considered;• Located in a flood zone, Sequential Test therefore required;• Advise site specific FRA as site does not benefit from any formal flood defences;• Underlain by a Secondary Aquifer;• Development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment;• If developed, existing Waste Transfer Station permit will need surrendering. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Environment Agency's comments have been stated in the Development Principles for this Land Allocation in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP.

List of respondees:

Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)

DS49 Castle College

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Loss of green space for local people and should be retained; | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No particular environmental constraints;• There is enough residential in the area, existing vacant properties should be addressed;• There are enough existing shops in the area which could be improved;• There are enough existing community, sports and leisure facilities (owing to redevelopment of Victoria Leisure Centre) which could be improved; |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many people use/enjoy the open space and this should be preserved/improved; • There is Japanese Knotweed on site. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The area of this site has been significantly reduced in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP so that the amount of green space allocated has decreased.
- The Preferred Option uses for this site are: residential, employment, community and education. The residential provision will help to meet the city-wide identified need for delivering new homes.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain (Environment Agency)
Miss Swan
Mr Harrison
Mr MacDonald

DS50 Eastside - Sneinton Market

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage advises this is a rare historic covered market example and in a conservation area, wishes to see historic structures retained | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EA recommends consulting the Environmental Health Officer regarding this site |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>and sensitively re-used, further site assessment/justification necessary to take forward as an allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nottingham Civic Society Need to be careful about appropriate scale not to overwhelm existing historic character and scale and regenerated | | <p>allocation due to proximity of Eastcroft Waste Facility as development could impact on its chimney's dispersion characteristics - this may require introducing a new sensitive receptor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in a flood zone, Sequential Test therefore required; • Underlain by a Principal Aquifer; • Development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment; |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The development principles for the site in the Preferred Option of the LAPP take on board Civic Society and English Heritage's response, however they also try to reflect the viability of the site

List of respondees:

Mr Tom Gilbert (English Heritage - East Midlands)
Mrs Hilary Silvester (Nottingham Civic Society)
Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)

DS51 Former Albany Works and Former Co-op Site

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for residential and supermarket use in this location; • Provides an opportunity to introduce a foodstore to Carlton Road, meeting the needs of locals and providing regeneration benefits; • The Carlton Road CoNI should be amended to incorporate DS51, reinstating Carlton Road (C28) as a local centre once the foodstore provision has been restored. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underlain by a Secondary Aquifer; • Development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment; • Would not wish to see out of hours use due to noise or any drop-in centre; • Would like a chip shop. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option Development Principles for this site incorporate the comments made by the Environment Agency.
- The Preferred Option proposed uses are retail and residential, it is not appropriate to specify that a chip shop be located on this site.
- The Carlton Road CoNI boundary has been amended in the Preferred Option version of the LAPP.

List of respondees:

Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)
Asda Stores Ltd
Miss Julie Adcock
Mr W Staniforth

DS52 Robin Hood Chase

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| • | • | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site falls within Source Protection Zone 3;• Records of contamination on parts of site, development may potentially cause pollution to ground water source, requires careful consideration and Environmental Assessment; |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Preferred Option Development Principles for this site incorporate the Environment Agency's comments.

List of respondees:

Mr Kazi Hussain (Environment Agency)

DS53 Victoria Centre Expansion

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage argue that mixed use development would be better for this site than a purely retail one; • Hopewells request clarification that this site no longer includes Base 51. Also concerned about the height of the cinema proposed (loss of light) and traffic arrangements; • A representation objects to building works on site, fearing excessive noise and contests that any meaningful jobs would result; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The site boundary has been redrawn to actually include Base 51 – this may cause concern to Hopewells.
- The uses referred to in the development principles for the site in the Preferred Option of the LAPP includes non retail town centre uses

List of respondees:

Mr Tom Gilbert (English Heritage - East Midlands)
Mr Chris Foulds
Mr Andrew Hopewell (Hopewells Furniture)

DS54 Radford Bridge Allotments (Option 1)

| Object* | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that allocation would conflict with the need to protect open space (in accordance with Chapter 7). • Believes planning department has long recognised area as ‘precious’ and should not be lost as open space. • Highlights benefits of open space. • Suggests independent year round survey of site’s flora and fauna before any planning application is considered. • Contends that flooding is already a problem in the area and will be exacerbated by further development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A combination of DS54 and DS55 should be identified within the final DPD (up to 140 dwellings). This will fulfil the requirements of the Core Strategy Policy 8 through addressing the significant shortage of good quality, family housing currently available within the city boundary. Approximately 20% of the dwellings will be affordable and these will be spread across the development. • A comprehensive approach to developing the area will ensure the long-term maintenance and preservation of ecological interests on the site. The longevity of allotments on the site would be secured through restructuring the allotment layout, broadly maintaining the existing number of allotments. Secured by S106 obligations, development of the site would also allow targeted investment to support conservation work on Martin's Pond and Harrisons Plantation Local Nature Reserve. This would involve the removal of silt from the pond, scrub removal and woodland thinning. Valuable wetland habitat could therefore be restored, promoting local | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No particular environmental constraints within remit impacting upon site |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>biodiversity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the sites would also significantly improve public open space provision for the local community. New pedestrian routes would provide access to the surrounding natural environment and would provide a link to Martin's Pond. • It is clear from detailed analysis that, through a combination of the two option sites, there is potential to deliver between 125-140 family and affordable homes. • The significant shortage of these housing types within the city highlights the importance of allocating this site for residential development. The precise form of the development will be determined by the opportunities and constraints of the site, particularly ecology, maintaining the provision of allotments and access. • This approach will ensure a comprehensive development of the site including increasing the provision of public open space and enabling investment to preserve and protect environmental assets. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over lack of allotments across City. • Concerns over previous SINC status and potential impact of development on protected species. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over population overcrowding in area and impact on schools, local services and traffic congestion. • Opposes housing target and provision of extra housing. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests filling empty homes and using brownfield land availability in the vicinity. • Radford Bridge allotments are situated next to Martin's Pond and Harrison's Plantation Local Nature Reserve. The allotments currently provide additional habitat and therefore add value to the LNRs, as they provide habitat that is relatively undisturbed when compared to the LNRs, which are used on a regular basis as an informal recreational facility by the local community. • Therefore concerned about the potential allocation of this site, as not only will there be a loss of habitat as a result, but there will be a significant increase in the level of use of the adjacent LNRs, resulting in a negative impact on habitats and wildlife in this area. • Also concerned about the loss of allotment sites in general, as there seems to be a demand that is not being met currently, which surely could be met by these sites if they were returned to a workable and rentable condition. However, we appreciate that the Radford Rd allotments are privately owned and that the City cannot therefore influence their use as allotments. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over population overcrowding in area and impact on schools, local services and traffic congestion. • Opposes housing target and provision of extra housing. • Suggests filling empty homes and using brownfield land availability in the vicinity. • Concerns over lack of allotments across City. • Concerns over previous SINC status and potential impact of development on protected species. • Concerns that boundary is artificial and is damaging to local wildlife. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
|---|---|---|

*Same objection submitted by multiple consultees

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Since consultation on the issues and options, a planning application was refused permission. The application site consisted part of sites DS54 and DS55.
- Reasons for refusal included: unacceptable loss of allotments / open space network, inadequate access, design, inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment and failure to include satisfactory financial contribution towards public open space.
- Site assessment for the Preferred Option concluded the same constraints identified by the planning application.

List of respondees:

Mrs Stevenson

Ms Jones Jenkins Notts Wildlife Trust

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

Mr Waumsley Freeth Cartwright LLP

Ms Wilson

Mr White

Mr Norman

Mrs Ash

Mrs Banham

Mr Barratt

Mr Barron

Mrs Bartholomew

Mr Batholomew

Mr Simpson

Mrs Morley

Mr Walton N.W.R.A

Mr Terry

Dr Pathan NHS

Mr Allsop

Mrs Allsopp

Mrs Birkinshaw

Mr Blackler

Mrs Blackler

Mrs Bloom

Mrs Dornan

Ms Box

Dr Denton

Mrs Drury

Mr Adcock
Ms Bostock
Mr Savidge British Sport Trust
Dr Dowd
Mrs Mason
Mr Armstrong Boots
Miss Carter
Miss Davis Boots
Mr Chaplin
Ms English Notts County Council
Ms Iwanczuk
Mrs Fairgrieve
Mrs Freeman
Mr Fry
Mrs Adcock
Aberdeen Property Investors
Mrs Allen
Mrs Beard
Mrs Lawry
Mrs Grayling
Mr Dolezal
Mrs Leake
Mr Dorman
Mrs Lee-Isted
Mr Green Nottingham Trent University
Mr Gibbons
Mrs Lloyd Friends of Wollaton Local Nature Reserves
Mr Hustler
Dr Grimley
Mrs Judson

Mrs Lowther
Mr Leithead
Mrs Bennett
Mrs Noble
Mrs Guo
Mr Carter
Mr Guyler
Mr Hallam
Mrs Hodgkinson
Mrs Richardson
Miss Opala
Mr Turley
Mrs Stevenson **Heart Lets**
Miss Martin
Mr Fairgrieve
Mrs Kane **RBS**
Mrs Ceurstemont
Mrs Law
Mrs Pearce
Mrs Terry
Mr Whittaker
Mrs Haley **BCS College**
Dr Clare
Mrs Nurse
Mrs Jambunathan
Mr Janes
Mrs Jespersen
Mrs McIvor
Mr Johnstone
Mr Judson

**Mr Jumbu
Mrs Verity
Mrs Marshall
Mr Munns
Mr Stephenson
Mr Simpson
Mr Mace
Mrs Plant
Mrs Kellgher
Ms Kennedy
Mrs Maher
Ms Marriott
Mrs Kenworthy
Mr Marshall
Mrs Kidd
Mr Mather
Miss Chaston
Mr McHenry
Mrs Dilks
Miss Dolezal
Mrs Leithead
Ms Watchorn
Mrs McMahan
Mr Lammas
Mr Meiguan
Ms Mellors
Mrs Rhodes Laseruk-Finance Company
Mr Foulkes
Miss Metcalfe
Mrs Frodsham**

Miss Guyler
Mr Borland
Mrs Mitson
Mr Cawthorne
Mr Romero Nottingham City Council
Mr Colman
Mrs Morley
Mr McMahon
Mrs Simpson
Dr Mowbray
Mrs Watson
Mr Samuels
Mr Domansky
Mr Hodgkinson
Miss Noble
Mr Terry
Mr O'Connell
Mrs Olds
Mr Weaver
Mr Gilbert
Mrs Goddard
Mrs Percival
Mrs Wilkinson
Mr Opala
Mr Hartshorne
Mr Herrod
Dr Noble
Mrs Asher
Mr Aslin
Mr Attwood

Mrs Hallam
Mr Kenworthy
Mr Barker
Mrs Yip
Mr Beard
Mrs Heath
Mrs Beardsall
Mrs Adcock
Mrs Bell **J Greenwood and Associates**
Mr Bennett
Mr Jones
Mr Booth
Miss Bremer
Mrs Browning
Mrs Maguire
Mr Adcock
Mrs Chaplin
Mr Drury
Mrs Mills
Mrs Opala
Mrs Smith
Mrs Cameron
Mrs Wood **Radford Bridge Road Allotments**
Miss Caudrey
Mrs Mabbott
Mr Chambers
Mrs Chapman
Mrs Duncan
Mrs Charmbury
Mr Chaston

Mrs Barker
Mr Clark
Mrs Eales
Mr Clifford
Mrs Eaton
Mr Edmondson
Ms Shardlow
Miss Samuels
Mrs Handley
Mr Hardy
Mrs Harrison
miss Hassett
Mr Henn
mr hooton
Mrs Humphreys
Mr Watson
Mr Hunt
Mr Wibberley
Mrs Ferguson **NTU**
Mr Wise
Mr Cotterill
Mrs Worsley
Dr Prudham
Mr & Mrs Toole
Mr Leithead
Mr Opala
Mrs Pott
Mrs Pinnock
Mr Samuels
Mr White

Mrs Weston
Mrs Richards
Mr Frodsham
Mrs Weston
Mr Swainson
Mr Gerrard Aurum Holdings
Mrs Davis
Mr Artis
Mrs Veasey
Miss Guyler
Mrs Staniland
Mr Spriggs
Mr Leake
Dr Watson
Mr Tindall
Mr Lloyd
Mr Smith
Mrs Whitbread
Mr Cotterill
Mr Mellors
Mrs Scarborough
Mrs Sanderson
Mr Thurgood
Mrs Thayan
Mrs Rhodes
Mr Reynolds
Mr Noble
Miss Rood
Mr Smith
Miss Terry

**Mr Foreman
Mrs Poulson
Mr & Mrs Qamar
Mr Gerrard
Mr Gibson
Mrs Green
Mr Pinnock
Mrs Guyler
Mrs Perczywski
Miss Berry
Mrs Hustler
Mr Place
Mr Phillips
Mrs Johnstone
Mr Weston
Mr Hancock
Miss Simpson
Mrs Harris
Mrs Farr
Mr Harrison
Mrs Tindall
Mr Holland
Mr Pearce
Mr Holloway
Mrs Holwell
Mrs Samuels
Mrs Borland
Mr Smith
Mr Beardsall
Mr Pennington**

**Mrs Gibbons
Mr & Mrs Percival
Mrs Kennedy
Mr Chapman
Mrs Verity
Mr Adams
Mr Allen
Miss Dolezal
Mrs Carter
Mrs Turley
Mrs Mather
Mr Mitson
Mrs Dolezal
Mrs Smith
Mrs Herrod
Mr Price
Mr West
Mr Richardson
Mrs Rogers
Mrs Smith
Mr Veasey
Mrs Gerrard
Mrs Artis
Mrs White
Mrs Steele
Mr Swinton
Mr Stevenson
Miss Opala
Mr Terry
Mrs whittaker**

**Mr Wilkinson
Ms Winterton
Mrs Hunt
Mrs Hancock
Mr Bennett
Mr Maher
Mr and Mrs Bird
Mr Anderson
Mrs Armstrong
Mrs Arthur
Mrs Ashman
Mr Burke
Mrs Barnes
Ms Begum
Mr Beswick
Mrs Bignell
Mr Boulton
Mr Rowlands
Dr Boyd
Mr Brailsford
Mr Brown
Mr Broxholme
Mrs Butts
Mr Seamark
Mrs Colman
Mrs Cook
Mr Smith
Mrs Cooper
Mr Shipston
Mrs Crawley**

Miss Dable
Mr Darbyshire
Mrs Jay
Miss Walker
Mrs Greaves
Mr Pott
Mrs Dean
Ms Denton
Miss Dickens
Mr Dilks
Mrs Martin
Mr McCall
Mr McGinley
Mrs Purdham
Mr Walter
Mrs Grigor
Mrs Hartshorne
Mrs Robinson
Mrs Rouse
Ms Bell
Mr Chaston
Mr Samra
Mrs Savage
Mr Sood
Mrs Stuart
Mrs Thurgood
Ms Tipple
Mrs Upton
Mrs Chaston
Mr Winfield

Mrs Walters
Ms Winfield
Mr Woolley
Mrs Cooper
Mr Rees
Mrs Rees
Mrs Penn
Mrs Mead
Mrs Dunlevy
Mrs Golding
Mr Golding
Mrs Graves
Mrs Hardy
Mr Hardy
Mrs Hill
Mr Lovell
Mrs Lovell
Mr & Mrs Laycock
Mr Leigh
Mr Martin
Mrs Barron
Mr Walker
Mrs Smith
Mrs Howard
Mr Olleson
Mr Paine
Mr Eaton
Ms Edney
Mr Flynn **Fast Web Media Ltd**
Mr Arkwright **St Anns Community Orchard**

Ms Kenning
Mr Matosic
Mr Rooms
Mr Slatcher
Mr Thomason
Mr Christy
Ms Robinson
Mr Wood National Environmental Research Council
Miss Perry
Mr Johnson
Mrs Doherty
Miss Hindle
Mrs Wilson
Mr Jones
Mrs Jones
Miss Sloane
Mr Chambers
Mrs Jay
Mr Minott
Mr Roberts
Mr Khosa
Mrs Khosa
Mr Hobster
Mr Garton
Mrs Bradley
Mrs Garton
Miss Worrall
Mr Garton
Miss Garton
Mr & Mrs Ferrigan

Mr Edmonds
Mr Brooks
Dr O'Neil
Mr Bignell
Mrs Seamark
Mr Plant
Mr Dunn
Mr Ceurstemont
Mr Fletcher
Mrs Fletcher
Mr Green
Mr Pearson
Mr Henderson **Residents Against Wollaton Allotment Development**
Mr & Mrs McClure
Mr Neville
Mr & Mrs Baynham
Mr English

Please check that Mr Anthony Beard's comments are included – thanks KS

DS55 Radford Bridge Allotments (Option 2)

| Object* | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Radford Bridge allotments are situated next to Martin's Pond and Harrison's Plantation Local Nature Reserve. The allotments currently provide additional habitat and therefore add value to the LNRs, as they provide habitat that is relatively undisturbed when compared to the LNRs, which | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A combination of DS54 and DS55 should be identified within the final DPD (up to 140 dwellings). This will fulfil the requirements of the Core Strategy Policy 8 through addressing the significant shortage of good quality, family housing currently available | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no particular environmental constraints within EA remit impacting upon the site |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>are used on a regular basis as an informal recreational facility by the local community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the potential allocation of this site, as not only will there be a loss of habitat as a result, but there will be a significant increase in the level of use of the adjacent LNRs, resulting in a negative impact on habitats and wildlife in this area. • Also concerned about the loss of allotment sites in general, as there seems to be a demand that is not being met currently, which surely could be met by these sites if they were returned to a workable and rentable condition. However, we appreciate that the Radford Rd allotments are privately owned and that the City cannot therefore influence their use as allotments. | <p>within the city boundary. Approximately 20% of the dwellings will be affordable and these will be spread across the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive approach to developing the area will ensure the long-term maintenance and preservation of ecological interests on the site. The longevity of allotments on the site would be secured through restructuring the allotment layout, broadly maintaining the existing number of allotments. Secured by S106 obligations, development of the site would also allow targeted investment to support conservation work on Martin's Pond and Harrison's Plantation Local Nature Reserve. This would involve the removal of silt from the pond, scrub removal and woodland thinning. Valuable wetland habitat could therefore be restored, promoting local biodiversity. • Development of the sites would also significantly improve public open space provision for the local community. New pedestrian routes would provide access to the surrounding natural environment and would provide a link to Martin's Pond. • It is clear from detailed analysis that, through a combination of the two options | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>sites, there is potential to deliver between 125-140 family and affordable homes. The significant shortage of these housing types within the city highlights the importance of allocating this site for residential development. The precise form of the development will be determined by the opportunities and constraints of the site, particularly ecology, maintaining the provision of allotments and access. This approach will ensure a comprehensive development of the site including increasing the provision of public open space and enabling investment to preserve and protect environmental assets.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should remain as allotments. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surprised that potential housing is put forward for this site, as in Chapter 7.9 of the same document reference is made that open space - including allotments - should be protected from development. Also, understood only land in DS54 Option 1 was removed from the protection of the SINC status. There is a small area of overlap between the two options, but assumes that most of Option 2 still has SINC status. • (1) Access via Trowell Road not practical. Impact of additional housing on local resources will also be negative (2) destruction of this section of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>allotments would be devastating both visually and environmentally, and heartbreaking for the gardeners. It is the best utilised and maintained area of the site, whereas in contrast the area in Option 1 has been under threat of potential development for many years, which has contributed to the rundown state of that area to the point where the plots are beyond the renovation of the normal gardener.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This whole site is part of a 'green lung' in a built-up area. This area of the allotments in Option 2 is the most actively gardened and preserved section, with many original damson bushes, native and fruit-bearing trees, which are of huge benefit to wildlife and could not be replaced within a lifetime. Historically, the local willows were used in the basket-making industry, and some of the allotment buildings were constructed using reclaimed materials from the Nottingham slum clearances. Even the main avenue paths have been hand constructed from ashes from local industry. There has been a resurgence of interest in growing-your-own, and the active gardeners in this section all benefit from being part of a gardening community. It would be disgraceful to destroy this haven, which has been some 65 years in the making been some 65 years in the making. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over population overcrowding in area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>and impact on schools, local services and traffic congestion. Opposes housing target and provision of extra housing. Suggests filling empty homes and using brownfield land availability in the vicinity. Concerns that allocation would conflict with the need to protect open space (in accordance with Chapter 7). Believes planning department has long recognised area as 'precious' and should not be lost as open space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlights benefits of open space. • Suggests independent year round survey of site's flora and fauna before any planning application is considered. • Contends that flooding is already a problem in the area and will be exacerbated by further development • Concerns over lack of allotments across City. Concerns over previous SINC status and potential impact of development on protected species. • Concerns that boundary is artificial and is damaging to local wildlife | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over loss of open space and potential impact on Archaeological Constraints Area • Concerns over flooding. • Suggests community / sports facilities as alternative use. • Concerns over loss of open space / ecological impact. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that boundary is artificial and is damaging to local wildlife in accordance with Chapter 7). • Believes planning department has long recognised area as 'precious' and should not be lost as open space. • Highlights benefits of open space. • Suggests independent year round survey of site's flora and fauna before any planning application is considered. • Contends that flooding is already a problem in the area and will be exacerbated by further development. • Concerns over population overcrowding in area and impact on schools, local services and traffic congestion. • Opposes housing target and provision of extra housing. • Suggests filling empty homes and using brownfield land availability in the vicinity. • Concerns over previous SINC status and potential impact of development on protected species. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over population overcrowding in area and impact on schools, local services and traffic congestion. • Opposes housing target and provision of extra housing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests filling empty homes and using brownfield land availability in the vicinity. • Concerns over previous SINC status and potential impact of development on protected species. • Concerns that boundary is artificial and is damaging to local wildlife. | | |
|---|--|--|

*Same objection submitted by multiple consultees

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Since consultation on the issues and options, a planning application was refused permission. The application site consisted part of sites DS54 and DS55.
- Reasons for refusal included: unacceptable loss of allotments / open space network, inadequate access, design, inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment and failure to include satisfactory financial contribution towards public open space.
- Site assessment for the Preferred Option concluded the same constraints identified by the planning application.

List of respondees:

Ms Jones Jenkins Notts Wildlife Trust
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Waumsley Freeth Cartwright LLP
Mr Smith
Ms Marshall
Dr Bassey
Mrs Bell
Ms Wilson
Mr White
Mr Norman

Mrs Ash
Mrs Banham
Mr Barratt
Mr Barron
Mrs Bartholomew
Mr Simpson
Mr Walton N.W.R.A
Mr Terry
Dr Pathan NHS
Mr Allsop
Mrs Allsopp
Mrs Birkinshaw
Mr Blackler
Mrs Blackler
Mrs Bloom
Mrs Dornan
Ms Box
Dr Denton
Mrs Drury
Ms Bostock
Mr Savidge British Sport Trust
Dr Dowd
Mrs Mason
Mr Armstrong Boots
Miss Carter
Miss Davis Boots
Mr Chaplin
Ms English Notts County Council
Ms Iwanczuk
Mrs Fairgrieve

Mrs Freeman
Mr Fry
Mrs Adcock
Mrs Allen
Mrs Grayling
Mrs Leake
Mrs Lee-Isted
Mr Green Nottingham Trent University
Mr Gibbons
Mrs Lloyd Friends of Wollaton Local Nature Reserves
Mr Hustler
Dr Grimley
Mrs Judson
Mrs Lowther
Mr Leithead
Mrs Bennett
Mrs Noble
Mrs Guo
Mr Carter
Mr Guyler
Mr Hallam
Mrs Hodkinson
Mrs Richardson
Miss Opala
Mr Turley
Mrs Stevenson Heart Lets
Miss Martin
Mr Fairgrieve
Mrs Kane RBS
Mrs Ceurstemont

Mrs Law
Mrs Pearce
Mr Whittaker
Mrs Haley BCS College
Dr Clare
Mrs Nurse
Mrs Jambunathan
Mrs Jespersen
Mrs McIvor
Mr Johnstone
Mr Judson
Mr Jumbu
Mrs Verity
Mrs Marshall
Mr Munns
Mr Fry
Mr Simpson
Mrs Plant
Ms Kennedy
Mrs Maher
Ms Marriott
Mrs Kenworthy
Mr Marshall
Mrs Kidd
Mr Mather
Miss Chaston
Mr McHenry
Mrs Dilks
Miss Dolezal
Mrs Leithead

**Ms Watchorn
Mrs McMahon
Mr Lammas
Mrs Rhodes Laseruk-Finance Company
Mr Foulkes
Mrs Frodsham
Miss Guyler
Mr Borland
Mrs Mitson
Mr Cawthorne
Mr Romero Nottingham City Council
Mr Colman
Mrs Morley
Mr McMahon
Mrs Simpson
Dr Mowbray
Mrs Watson
Mr Samuels
Mr Gerrard
Mr Hodgkinson
Miss Noble
Mr Terry
Mr O'Connell
Mrs Olds
Mr Weaver
Mr Gilbert
Mrs Glover
Mrs Goddard
Mrs Percival
Miss Straw**

Mrs Wilkinson
Mr Opala
Mr Herrod
Dr Noble
Mrs Asher
Mr Aslin
Mr Attwood
Mrs Hallam
Mr Kenworthy
Mrs Yip
Mr Beard
Mrs Heath
Mrs Beardsall
Mrs Adcock
Mrs Bell **J Greenwood and Associates**
Mr Bennett
Mr Booth
Mrs Jones
Miss Bremer
Mrs Browning
Mrs Maguire
Mr Brown
Mr Adcock
Mrs Chaplin
Mr Drury
Mrs Opala
Mrs Smith
Mrs Cameron
Mrs Wood **Radford Bridge Road Allotments**
Miss Caudrey

Mrs Mabbott
Mr Chambers
Mrs Chapman
Mrs Charmbury
Mr Chaston
Mrs Barker
Mr Clark
Mrs Eales
Mr Clifford
Mrs Eaton
Mr Edmondson
Ms Shardlow
Mrs Handley
Mr Hardy
Mrs Harrison
miss Hassett
Mr Henn
mr hooton
Mrs Humphreys
Mr Watson
Mr Hunt
Miss Fanning
Mr Wibberley
Mrs Ferguson **NTU**
Mr Wise
Mr Cotterill
Mrs Worsley
Dr Prudham
Mr & Mrs Toole
Mr Opala

**Mrs Pott
Mrs Pinnock
Mr Samuels
Mr White
Mrs Weston
Mrs Richards
Mr Frodsham
Mrs Weston
Mrs Darbyshire
Mr Swainson
Mr Gerrard Aurum Holdings
Mrs Davis
Mr Artis
Mrs Veasey
Miss Guyler
Mrs Staniland
Dr Dornan
Mr Spriggs
Mr Leake
Dr Watson
Mr Tindall
Mr Lloyd
Mr Duncan
Miss Orange
Mr Smith
Mrs Whitbread
Mrs Bennett
Mr Cotterill
Mr Mellors
Mrs Scarborough**

Mrs Sanderson
Mr Thurgood
Mrs Thayan
Mrs Walton
Mrs Rhodes
Mrs Sood
Mr Roe
Mr Reynolds
Mr Noble
Miss Rood
Mr Smith
Miss Khan
Miss Terry
Mrs Newton
Mr Foreman
Mrs Poulson
Mr Walker
Mr & Mrs Qamar
Mr Gibson
Mr Meighan
Mrs Green
Mr Pinnock
Mrs Perczywski
Miss Berry
Mrs Hustler
Mr Place
Mr Phillips
Mr Murfin
Mrs Johnstone
Mrs Murfin

**Mr Weston
Mr Hancock
Miss Simpson
Metcalf
Mrs Harding
Mrs Farr
Mr Harrison
Mr Fegurson
Mrs Tindall
Mr Holland
Mr Pearce
Mr Holloway
Mrs Holwell
Mrs Richards
Mrs Samuels
Ms Foulkes
Mrs Borland
Mr Foulkes
Mr Smith
Mr Foulkes
Mr Beardsall
Mrs Walker
Mrs Gibbons
Mr Stevenson
Mr & Mrs Percival
Mr Chapman
Mrs Verity
Mr Adams
Mr Allen
Miss Dolezal**

**Mrs Carter
Mrs Turley
Mrs Mather
Mr Mitson
Mrs Dolezal
Mrs Smith
Mrs Herrod
Mr Price
Mr West
Mr Richardson
Mrs Rogers
Mrs Smith
Mr Veasey
Miss Andrews
Mrs Gerrard
Mrs Artis
Mrs White
Mrs Steele
Mrs Straw
Mr Swinton
Mr Stevenson
Miss Opala
Mr Terry
Mr Verity
Mrs whittaker
Mr Wilkinson
Mr Worthington
Mrs Hunt
Mrs Hancock
Mr Beard**

**Mr Bennett
Mr Maher
Mr and Mrs Bird
Mrs Armstrong
Mrs Arthur
Mr Boulton
Mr Rowlands
Mr Brown
Mr Seamark
Mrs Colman
Mr Smith
Mrs Cooper
Mr Shipston
Mr Straw
Mrs Straw
Mrs Pennington
Mrs Jay
Mrs Prudham
Miss Walker
Mrs Greaves
Mrs Terry
Mr Pott
Mr Dilks
Mrs Martin
Mr McCall
Mr McGinley
Mr Doherty
Mrs Robinson
Mrs Rouse
Mr Chaston**

**Mr Samra
Mrs Stuart
Mrs Thurgood
Mrs Chaston
Mr Winfield
Mrs Walters
Mr Bartholomew
Mr Johnson
Mr Rees
Mrs Rees
Mrs Penn
Mrs Mead
Mr Verity
Mrs Dunlevy
Mrs Golding
Mr Golding
Mrs Graves
Mrs Hains
Mrs Hardy
Mr Hardy
Mrs Hill
Mr Lovell
Mrs Lovell
Mrs Kelleher
Mr & Mrs Laycock
Mr Leigh
Mr Martin
Mr Tredwell Stone
Mrs Barron
Mrs Whalley**

Mr Winfield
Mr Walker
Mr Grigor
Mr Morley
Mr Stockley
Mrs Smith
Mr Paine
Mr Eaton
Ms Edney
Mr Flynn **Fast Web Media Ltd**
Mr Arkwright **St Anns Community Orchard**
Mr Cannon
Ms Kenning
Mrs Adams
Mrs Anderson
Mr Ashman
Mr Matosic
Mr Rooms
Mr Slatcher
Mr Thomason
Mr Wood **National Environmental Research Council**
Mrs Romero
Mrs Brailsford
Mrs Broadrick
Miss Perry
Mr Burgess
Miss Butts
Mrs Cawthorne
Mr Crawley
Mr Dean

Mrs Domansky
Mr Barnes
Mr Johnson
Mrs Jones
Mrs Olleson
Miss Hindle
Mrs Wilson
Mr Jones
Mrs Jones
Mr Chambers
Mrs Jay
Mr Osbourne
Mr Minott
Mr Roberts
Mr Khosa
Mrs Khosa
Mr Pearson
Mr Garton
Mrs Bradley
Miss Worrall
Mr Garton
Miss Garton
Mr & Mrs Ferrigan
Mrs Wragg
Ms Wheatcroft
Ms Brawn
Mr Edmonds
Mr Brooks
Ms Gilbert
Mrs Crump

Mrs Seamark
Mr Ceurstemont
Mr Fletcher
Mrs Fletcher
Ms Kirkham
Mr Green
Mr Pearson
Mr Henderson **Residents Against Wollaton Allotment Development**
Mr & Mrs McClure
Mr & Mrs Baynham
Mr English
Mr Walker

DS56 Woodyard Lane

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respondee has been contacted by a concerned resident whose property adjoins the Siemens Site at Wollaton, potential site allocation DS56. Woodyard Lane, as badgers visit her garden each night from the Siemens site and appear to be resident on the site. Resident is concerned about the potential loss of this area for the badgers to development and requested that we make you aware that there will be an issue with badgers, should this allocation and subsequent development proceed. Badgers are a particularly contentious issue in Wollaton as there appear to be a number of social groups living in the area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no particular environmental constraints within EA remit impacting upon the site Site could be identified as a possible site for a local commuter train station. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>which regularly visit gardens but which are increasingly losing their habitat to development. About a year ago a sett was bulldozed on Lambourne Drive, prior to an application to develop the plot of land for a residential care home, which has subsequently been built. The local residents were understandably outraged and very upset and are keen that this does not happen again.</p> | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should not be a preferred option | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over loss of open space and potential impact on Archaeological Constraints Area. • Concerns over potential impact on local services and facilities, as well as traffic. Concerns over flooding. • Suggests community / sports facilities as alternative use. • Concerns over traffic at access. • Concerns over loss of open space / ecological impact. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over population overcrowding in area and impact on schools, local services and traffic congestion. • Opposes housing target and provision of extra housing. • Suggests filling empty homes and using brownfield land availability in the vicinity. • Concerns over lack of allotments across City. • Concerns over previous SINC status and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>potential impact of development on protected species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that boundary is artificial and is damaging to local wildlife. • Concerns that allocation would conflict with the need to protect open space (in accordance with Chapter 7). • Believes planning department has long recognised area as ‘precious’ and should not be lost as open space. • Highlights benefits of open space. • Suggests independent year round survey of site’s flora and fauna before any planning application is considered. • Contends that flooding is already a problem in the area and will be exacerbated by further development. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over loss of open space and potential impact on Archaeological Constraints Area. • Concerns over traffic at access. • Concerns over potential impact on local services and facilities, as well as traffic. • Concerns over flooding. • Suggests community / sports facilities as alternative use. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing access to the site is constrained. There will be problems during both the constructional and operational phases. • Woodyard Lane is not sufficiently wide to be a 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>way access. Would be better if this remained a key pedestrian route.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposes use of Tom Blower Close and the unadopted stub road in the NW of Tom Blower Close as a potential access route. Could lead to safety issues in terms of children playing or an increase in crime. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of site is green space. If Siemens move from site, better use would be park / leisure space to create a wildlife corridor / provide community facilities. • Strongly opposed to residential development on this site. • Additional dwellings would place additional stretch on existing infrastructure in the area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be retained for recreation - there are few playing fields or open spaces remaining in Wollaton and facilities in Wollaton Park may be lost with change under English Heritage. • The site is a wildlife corridor between the railway cutting and the local nature reserve (Harrison's and Martin's Ponds) and its development would significantly deplete the wildlife network that includes the nature reserve and Wollaton Park • Boundary follows existing site used by Siemens - current access to the site via Woodyard Lane is by a narrow lane which would be totally inadequate for development needs. By implication, access would need to be directly onto | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Lambourne Drive, possibly with the loss of an existing home.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access would be into Lambourne Drive and Ilkeston Road, both increasingly busy roads. Ilkeston Road has significant congestion at rush-hours and weekend daytime. Residential development would put additional pressure on the already oversubscribed local schools. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site forms part of a green area and the development on this unused land should recognise the historical facts. The area which formed the Raleigh sports field made up an even larger green belt around the city centre and these surviving patches are needed to preserve a safe haven for wildlife. • I think the boundary is already defined by the Railway Line and Allotments. • If this site could be used for sports facilities the area would benefit. Glaisdale Drive has already several open 'brownfield sites' undeveloped in the established industrial area. • There is space on the Glaisdale Drive Industrial sites for new development so the conversion of this land is not required. It is suggested that a better use of this flat green space could be for sports facilities if, for instance, the area with Wollaton Park is to be changed from its existing football pitches. • The area is one small part of an open space that I | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>have enjoyed for over 65 years. Further industrialisation will further reduce the sense of peace and quiet the Nature Reserves provide with walking distance of home.</p> | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned over access. The existing access to Woodyard Lane from Tom Blower Close is already dangerous, further traffic around that intersection is liable to increase road traffic accident rates. A new entrance further along Woodyard Lane to meet Lambourne Drive would be required. • Access further along Lambourne Drive has already been provisioned during the building of the Torvill and Dean Estate. There is also a lot of foot traffic over the bridge to Aspley which given the relatively low level of day time usage from • Siemens staff is not an issue today. Would have concerns over the width of Woodyard Lane and the access for foot traffic along that route • At a community session last year on City schooling the City Council already recognised that the Wollaton and Lenton Abbey area already suffered from a lack of school places. • Proposing housing is likely to increase the demand for school places which last year Nottingham City Council had no adequate plans to support. Whilst the Council are looking for sensible residential sites the recent addition of the old Booker site has shown that such housing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>generates the need for 2 school places per dwelling, assuming similar dwellings to those currently in the area. This proposal only works with others being turned over for school use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • infrastructure will not support the desire of NCC to reduce car use in the city as the local NCT service only runs during work hours therefore not supporting workers. The Trent Barton 2 service is already overstretched during commuting hours and the roads are already overloaded with cars from the local area and Ilkeston borders. Whilst you have/ are introducing the workplace parking levy this is not being used to improve local transportation services in the ward. Line 2 is great but of no use to these developments. Line 1 is also of no use. The intersection at Crown Island between Wollaton Road and the Ring Road is already over capacity and is in need of further improvement/ traffic controls. The produced developments make that situation more critical. | | |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Site is partly located within the open space network in the Nottingham Local Plan (2005). Site is in active use as employment. Surrounding uses consist of train line and residential. It is recommended that the site is taken forward as a Preferred Option, given the current context.

List of respondees:

Ms Jones Jenkins Notts Wildlife Trust

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

Councillor Longford Nottingham City Council

Mr Smith

Dr Bassey

Mrs Bell

Ms Wilson

Mr White

Mrs Ash

Mrs Banham

Mr Barratt

Mr Barron

Mrs Bartholomew

Mr Batholomew

Mr Simpson

Mr Walton N.W.R.A

Mr Terry

Mr Allsop

Mrs Allsopp

Mr Blackler

Mrs Blackler

Mrs Bloom

Dr Denton

Mrs Drury

Mr Bradley

Mr Bradley

Mr Bradley

Mr Doran

Mr Savidge British Sport Trust
Dr Dowd
Mrs Mason
Mr Armstrong Boots
Miss Carter
Miss Davis Boots
Mr Chaplin
Ms English Notts County Council
Ms Iwanczuk
Mrs Fairgrieve
Mrs Freeman
Mr Fry
Mrs Adcock
Mrs Allen
Mrs Beard
Mrs Grayling
Mr Dolezal
Mrs Leake
Mrs Lee-Isted
Mr Green Nottingham Trent University
Mr Gibbons
Mrs Lloyd Friends of Wollaton Local Nature Reserves
Mr Hustler
Dr Grimley
Mrs Judson
Mrs Lowther
Mr Leithead
Mrs Noble
Mrs Guo
Mr Carter

Mr Guyler
Mr Hallam
Mrs Hodkinson
Mrs Richardson
Miss Opala
Mr Turley
Mrs Stevenson **Heart Lets**
Miss Martin
Mr Fairgrieve
Mrs Kane **RBS**
Mrs Ceurstemont
Mrs Law
Mrs Pearce
Mrs Terry
Mr Whittaker
Mrs Haley **BCS College**
Mrs Nurse
Mrs Jambunathan
Mr Janes
Mrs Jespersen
Mrs McIvor
Mr Johnstone
Mr Judson
Mr Jumbu
Mrs Verity
Mrs Marshall
Mr Munns
Mr Fry
Mr Simpson
Mrs Plant

**Ms Kennedy
Mrs Maher
Ms Marriott
Mrs Kenworthy
Mr Marshall
Mrs Kidd
Mr Mather
Miss Chaston
Mr McHenry
Mrs Dilks
Miss Dolezal
Mrs Leithead
Ms Watchorn
Mr Lammas
Mr Meiguan
Mrs Rhodes Laseruk-Finance Company
Mr Foulkes
Mrs Frodsham
Miss Guyler
Mr Borland
Mrs Mitson
Mr Cawthorne
Mr Romero Nottingham City Council
Mr Colman
Mrs Morley
Dr Mowbray
Mrs Watson
Mr Samuels
Mr Domansky
Miss Noble**

Mr O'Connell
Mrs Olds
Mr Weaver
Mr Gilbert
Mrs Goddard
Mrs Wilkinson
Mr Opala
Mr Herrod
Dr Noble
Mrs Asher
Mr Aslin
Mr Attwood
Mrs Hallam
Mr Kenworthy
Mrs Yip
Mr Beard
Mrs Beardsall
Mr Beggs
Mrs Bell **J Greenwood and Associates**
Mr Bennett
Mrs Bikinshaw
Mr Booth
Miss Bremer
Mrs Browning
Mr Brown
Mr Adcock
Mrs Chaplin
Mr Drury
Mrs Opala
Mrs Smith

Mrs Cameron
Miss Caudrey
Mrs Mabbott
Mr Chambers
Mrs Charmbury
Mr Chaston
Ms Christopollos
Mrs Barker
Mr Clark
Mrs Eales
Mr Clifford
Mrs Eaton
Mr Cook
Mr Edmondson
Ms Shardlow
Miss Samuels
Mrs Handley
Mr Hardy
Mrs Harrison
Mr Henn
mr hooton
Mrs Humphreys
Mr Watson
Mr Hunt
Miss Fanning
Mr Wibberley
Mr Wise
Mr Cotterill
Mrs Worsley
Dr Prudham

Mr & Mrs Toole
Mr Leithead
Mr Opala
Mrs Pott
Mrs Pinnock
Mr Samuels
Mr White
Mrs Weston
Mr Frodsham
Mrs Weston
Mrs Darbyshire
Mr Swainson
Mr Gerrard Aurum Holdings
Mrs Davis
Mr Artis
Mrs Veasey
Miss Guyler
Mrs Staniland
Dr Dornan
Dr Pathan
Mr Spriggs
Mr Leake
Dr Watson
Mr Tindall
Mr Lloyd
Mr Duncan
Mrs Armstrong
Mr Smith
Mrs Whitbread
Mrs Bennett

**Mr Cotterill
Mr Mellors
Mrs Scarborough
Mrs Sanderson
Mr Thurgood
Mrs Rhodes
Mr Noble
Miss Rood
Mr Smith
Miss Terry
Mr Foreman
Mrs Forshaw
Mrs Poulson
Mr Walker
Mr & Mrs Qamar
Mr Gerrard
Mr Gibson
Mrs Green
Mr Pinnock
Mrs Guyler
Mrs Eftekhari
Mrs Perczywski
Miss Berry
Mrs Hustler
Mr Place
Mr Phillips
Mr Murfin
Mrs Johnstone
Mrs Murfin
Mr Weston**

Mr Hancock
Miss Simpson
Mrs Harding
Mrs Harris
Mr Harrison
Mrs Tindall
Mr Holland
Mr Pearce
Mr Holloway
Mrs Holwell
Mrs Richards
Mrs Samuels
Mrs Borland
Mr Smith
Mr Beardsall
Mrs Walker
Mrs Gibbons
Mr Stevenson
Mr & Mrs Percival
Mrs Kellerer
Mr Khan
Mr Chapman
Mr Dainty Future Health Biobank
Mrs Verity
Mr Adams
Mr Allen
Miss Dolezal
Mrs Carter
Mrs Turley
Mrs Mather

**Mr Mitson
Mrs Dolezal
Mrs Smith
Mrs Herrod
Mr West
Mrs Rogers
Miss Anderson
Mrs Smith
Mr Veasey
Miss Andrews
Mrs Gerrard
Mrs Artis
Mrs White
Mr Swinton
Mr Stevenson
Miss Opala
Mr Terry
Mr Verity
Mrs whittaker
Mr Wilkinson
Ms Winterton
Mrs Hunt
Mrs Hancock
Mr Beard
Mr Bennett
Mr Maher
Mr Maeb
Mr and Mrs Bird
Mrs Arthur
Mr Boulton**

**Mr Rowlands
Mr Seamark
Mr Smith
Mr Shipston
Mrs Jay
Mrs Prudham
Miss Walker
Mrs Greaves
Mr Pott
Mr Dilks
Mrs Martin
Mr McCall
Mrs Robinson
Mrs Rouse
Mr Chaston
Mr Samra
Mrs Stuart
Mrs Thurgood
Mrs Chaston
Mr Winfield
Mrs Walters
Mr Woolley
Mr Robson
Mrs Roe
Mr Rynolds
Mrs Stockley
Mrs Thayan
Mr Rees
Mrs Rees
Mrs Mead**

**Mr Verity
Mrs Walter
Mr Whalley
Mrs Dunlevy
Mrs Golding
Mr Golding
Mrs Graves
Mrs Hardy
Mrs Hill
Mr & Mrs Laycock
Mr Leigh
Mr Martin
Mrs Barron
Mr Walker
Mr Lievesley
Mrs Smith
Mr Paine
Mr Eaton
Ms Edney
Mr Flynn Fast Web Media Ltd
Dr Daunt
Mrs Barnes
Mr Johnson
Mrs Wilson
Mr Jones
Mrs Jones
Mrs Jay
Mr Khosa
Mrs Khosa
Mr Garton**

Mrs Bradley
Mr Garton
Miss Garton
Mr Kay
Ms Anderson
Mr & Mrs Ferrigan
Mrs Wragg
Mr Bignell
Mrs Crump
Mr Fletcher
Mrs Fletcher
Mr Green
Mr & Mrs McClure
Mr Neville
Mr & Mrs Baynham
Mr English

DS57 Broadmarsh Shopping Centre

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider that mixed use development would be better for this site than solely retail. • Development criteria should include the need to restore and enhance this part of the City Centre. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Site considered appropriate for primarily retail use but other uses appropriate as part of a mixed use scheme.
- Development principles require development which is sensitive to the historic environment, incorporating high quality public realm, to help restore historic grain and enhance the setting of heritage assets.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency

DS58 Canal Street North

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 137 Canal street is in good condition with tenant on long term lease. The buildings on site are in good condition, including the largest building on site which is a new building. • Development would impact on businesses which have invested in current location, and may jeopardise jobs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in close proximity to Eastcroft Energy from Waste facility and the London Road Heat Station boiler emission point. Development would require further assessment in respect to air pollution • Site is located in high flood risk area. Flood risk sequential test required |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- After reviewing the comments received and a possibly revising the site into 2 sites, it has been decided not to take this site forward.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Ms Durrant
Mr Senior Senior Internet Ltd

DS59 Eastside - Island Site

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|--|
| • | • | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Retain elements of 'green' within the development• Environment Agency comments remain as expressed in previous (Extant) planning permission |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- This site benefits from an extant planning permission and therefore the comments the Environment Agency made at the planning application stage remain valid.
- The outline planning permission and the development principles both incorporate some open space

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Massey

DS60 NG2 South

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site is currently underutilised and should be considered for future development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site is close proximity to a clinical Waste Treatment plant• Site is in a high flood risk area (Zones 3 and 2).• Flood risk sequential test required prior to development• Environmental assessment required to prevent pollution to principle aquifer underlying the site.• Uses on site could include office, retail, leisure and hotel.• The site could accommodate a multi story building.• The wider site is in need of |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | ancillary supporting uses and amenities for staff – e.g. pub/leisure/restaurant. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The development principles take on board the comments made by the Environment Agency
- NG2 has successfully attracted a range of businesses and it is hoped that NG2 South will attract businesses. Business is considered to be a more appropriate use at this location

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Chris Waumsley, for Chatsworth Developments Ltd

DS61 NG2 West

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments related to NG2 West, behind Kings Meadow campus and to the south side of the Lenton Triangle, beside the railway line. A change from employment to student accommodation on the grounds of location is recommended and that it must be least | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is located in an area of high flood risk (Zones 3 and 2). Flood risk sequential test required. • Environmental assessment required to consider |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>attractive site for potential employers on the NG2 site. The site is close to the University and Tram, with easy access to the City Centre.</p> | | <p>potential impact to principal aquifer under site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest proposed use changed from employment to student accommodation. NG2 West, behind Kings Meadow Campus and to the south side of the Lenton Triangle, beside the railway line would be ideal for student accommodation. Close to the University and the Tram, with easy access to the City Centre. The least attractive site for potential employers on the NG2 site |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- NG2 has successfully attracted a range of businesses and it is hoped that NG2 West will attract businesses. Business is considered to be a more appropriate use at this location
- The development principles take on board the comments made by the Environment Agency

List of respondees:

Councillor Trimble Nottingham City Council
Councillor Piper Nottingham City Council
Mr Harte Lenton Housing Regeneration Group
Mr Hussain Environment Agency

DS62 Riverside Way

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The redevelopment of riverside way and surrounding environs is a positive step and long overdue. The river within the site is a feature which should be exploited | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in close proximity to a Clinical Waste Treatment Plant • Prior written Environment Agency (EA) consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top of river bank. • EA would resist any proposals to build on river leen culvert. • The site is located in area of high flood risk (zones 2 & 3) – flood risk sequential test and site specific FRA required. • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource. • Any development in this area should be no more than 6 stories high including the |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>ground floor and any flood platform.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meadows Precinct should remain where it is. Any new housing in the Meadows (or anywhere) must be and must be seen to be offered for competitive tendering. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Flood risk , the potential for contamination from development and the appropriateness of building heights would be considered, amongst other issues, as part of the planning application process.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Hughes
Mr Morley, Paul Smith

DS63 Southside - Arkwright Street East

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object due to an ongoing dispute with | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the 'Mixed Use' allocation as | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site lies partly within |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Nottingham City Council ,relating to the ability of Akido Medz ('the Medz') to trade</p> | <p>proposed, subject to the proviso that (the Moore Group's) future commercial development proposals for the land are not prejudiced by the allocation.</p> | <p>the Station Conservation Area and contains buildings of heritage value. Further assessment and justification of this site would be necessary in order to take it forward as an allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is close to Eastcroft Energy facility and London Road Heat Station – assessment of impact from air pollution may be necessary. • Site located in area of medium flood risk (zone 2). • opportunity to open up the watercourse, which could provide a green corridor with associated amenity and wildlife benefits. • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource • Concern re development sites next to Station - impact on townscape, conservation area, historic buildings |
|---|---|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option' allocation incorporating a range of use options including commercial / offices.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area and exploits potential offered by watercourses (including canal), respects and enhances listed buildings and site context, and also addresses proximity of the site to the Eastcroft Energy Facility and London Road Station in terms of amenity of occupiers.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.
- Development Management Policy included within document concerning sustainable energy policies and exploitation of localised energy networks.
- Objection based on separate dispute between Akido Medz and Nottingham City Council is not a planning consideration.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Duke
The Moore Group
Hilary Silvester, Civic Society

DS64 Southside - Midland Railway Station/The Hub

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|--|
| • | • | • Further assessment and justification of this site would be necessary in order to take it forward as an allocation. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site incorporates the Grade II* railway (East Midlands) station and is covered by the Station Conservation Area • Appropriate development criteria would need to be set. • EA comments as set out in unimplemented extant permission (08/01173/PFUL3) remain • Concern re development sites next to Station - impact on townscape, conservation area, historic buildings |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- 'Preferred option' allocation incorporates a reduced area of land that excludes the Midland Station and adjoining land in respect of which approved development is already substantially complete.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area, respects and enhances listed buildings and site context, and also addresses proximity of the site to the Eastcroft Energy Facility and London Road Station in terms of amenity of occupiers.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Hilary Silvester, Civic Society

DS65 Southside - Sheriffs Way/Arkwright Street

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Object due to a ongoing dispute with the Nottingham city council ,which does not allow (Akido Medz 'the Medz') to trade | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">This site lies partly within the Station Conservation Area and contains buildings of heritage value.If taken forward further assessment and justification in relation to heritage assets would be required and development criteria set out.The site is close to Eastcroft Energy facility and London Road Heat Station – assessment of impact from air pollution may be necessaryConcern re development sites next to Station - |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | impact on townscape, conservation area, historic buildings |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option' allocation incorporating a range of use options.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area and exploits potential offered by watercourses (including canal), respects and enhances listed buildings and site context, and also addresses proximity of the site to the Eastcroft Energy Facility and London Road Station in terms of amenity of occupiers.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.
- Development Management Policy included within document concerning sustainable energy policies and exploitation of localised energy networks.
- Objection based on separate dispute between Akido Medz and Nottingham City Council is not a planning consideration.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Duke
Hilary Silvester, Civic Society

DS66 Southside - Site of Former Hicking Pentecost & Company

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site lies partly within the Station Conservation Area and contains buildings of heritage value. • If taken forward further assessment and justification in relation to heritage assets would be required and development criteria set out. • The information received by EA in relation to planning permission/renewal application for the site demonstrated to the EA that environmental issues within their remit can be satisfactorily addressed on-site. • Concern re development sites next to Station - impact on townscape, conservation area, historic buildings |
|---|---|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option' allocation incorporating a range of use options.

- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area and exploits potential offered by watercourse, respects and enhances site context, and also addresses proximity of the site to the Eastcroft Energy Facility and London Road Station in terms of amenity of occupiers.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.
- Development Management Policy included within document concerning sustainable energy policies and exploitation of localised energy networks.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Hilary Silvester, Civic Society

DS67 Southside – Southpoint

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|---|
| • | • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site lies partly within the Station Conservation Area and contains buildings of heritage value. • If taken forward further assessment and justification in relation to heritage assets would be required and development criteria set out |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information received by EA in relation to planning permission/renewal application for the site demonstrated to the EA that environmental issues within their remit can be satisfactorily addressed on-site. • Concern re development sites next to Station - impact on townscape, conservation area, historic buildings |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area and exploits potential offered by watercourse, respects and enhances listed buildings and site context.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.
- Development Management Policy included within document concerning sustainable energy policies and exploitation of localised energy networks.
-

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mrs Naomi Doughty Environment Agency
Hilary Silvester, Civic Society

DS68 Southside - Sovereign House

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• EA comments remain as set out in Planning permission (06/01916/PFUL3) |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

DS69 Southside - Waterway Street

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Residential use may not be conducive to operational activities at Castle Rock business. Allowing change of use and potentially residential accommodation close to Castle Rock brewery may detrimentally affect that business. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site is close to Eastcroft Energy facility and London Road Heat Station – assessment of impact from air pollution may be necessary.• Site is located in an area of |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>medium flood risk. A flood risk sequential test is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource • Concern that the mix may include entertainment venues or heavy industrial uses. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Development Principles accompanying the ‘Preferred Option’ allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area, respects and enhances site context and has regard to relationship of site with nearby uses.
- Development Principles accompanying the ‘Preferred Option’ allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.
- ‘Preferred Option’ allocation does not incorporate heavy industrial uses.
- Development Management policies included within ‘Preferred Option’ to regulate entertainment uses and their potential effects in terms of issues such as highways and noise.
- Development Management Policies included in relation to noise and sound insulation.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Wilde Castle Rock Brewery
Ms Ball

DS70 Waterside - British Waterways Owned Part of Meadow Lane Site

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is close to Eastcroft Energy facility and London Road Heat Station – assessment of impact from air pollution may be necessary. • Prior written EA consent required for works within 8 metres of riverbank and EA access should be secured within design. • There should be no built development on top of the culvert on site. • The opportunity should be taken to open up the watercourse, which could provide a green corridor with associated amenity and wildlife benefits. • This site is located in an area of high flood risk (Zones 3 and 2). Site specific FRA is required. • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Incorporated as a 'Preferred Option' within wider land allocation.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area and exploits potential offered by watercourses, respects and enhances site context, and also addresses proximity of the site to the Eastcroft Energy Facility and London Road Heat Station.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.
- Development Management Policy included within document concerning sustainable energy policies and exploitation of localised energy networks.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Dickinson Canals & River Trust

DS71 Waterside - Eastcroft Depot

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---------------|---|--|
| • | • The site does not achieve its potential nor does it make any positive contribution to the surrounding landscape or the industrial heritage of the canal | • The site includes four Grade II listed buildings which would need to be retained and not harmed. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has the potential to provide a mix of commercial uses and the much needed high quality office floorspace that the city needs. • Request that any future developments on site be required to take into account proximity to Eastcroft energy /waste so as to minimise the potential for complaints from any new tenants or residents. • New development should have capacity to connect to district heating system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further assessment and justification of this site would be necessary in order to take place. Appropriate development criteria would need to be set. • Site is close to Eastcroft Energy facility and London Road Heat Station – assessment of impact from air pollution may be necessary. • There should be no built development on top of the culvert on site. • The opportunity should be taken to open up the watercourse, which could provide a green corridor with associated amenity and wildlife benefits. • This site is located in an area of high flood risk (Zones 3 and 2). Site specific FRA is required. • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental assessment required to avoid contamination to |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> groundwater resource |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option' allocation incorporating a range of use options including commercial / offices.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area and exploits potential offered by watercourses (including canal), respects and enhances listed buildings and site context, and also addresses proximity of the site to the Eastcroft Energy Facility and London Road Station in terms of amenity of occupiers.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.
- Development Management Policy included within document concerning sustainable energy policies and exploitation of localised energy networks.

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Nicholson Waste Recycling Group
Oakhill Group

DS72 Waterside - Former Hartwells

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site does not achieve its potential nor does it make any positive contribution to | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is close to Eastcroft Energy facility and London |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>the surrounding landscape or the industrial heritage of the canal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has the potential to provide a mix of commercial uses and the much needed high quality office floorspace that the city needs. • Request that any future developments on site be required to take into account proximity to Eastcroft energy /waste to minimise the potential for complaints from any new tenants or residents. • New development should have capacity to connect to district heating system | <p>Road Heat Station – assessment of impact from air pollution may be necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site abuts an area at risk of flooding • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource • |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as ‘Preferred Option’ allocation incorporating a range of use options including commercial / offices.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area and exploits potential offered by canal, respects and enhances site context, and also addresses proximity of the site to the Eastcroft Energy Facility and London Road Station in terms of amenity of occupiers.
- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.
- Development Management Policy included within document concerning sustainable energy policies and exploitation of localised energy networks.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Nicholson Waste Recycling Group
Oakhill Group

DS73 Waterside - Iremonger Road

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is close to Eastcroft Energy facility and London Road Heat Station – assessment of impact from air pollution may be necessary. • This site is located in an area of high flood risk (Zones 3 and 2). Site specific FRA is required. • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Development Principles accompanying the ‘Preferred Option’ allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

DS74 Waterside - Meadow Lane

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is close to Eastcroft Energy facility and London Road Heat Station – assessment of impact from air pollution may be necessary. • Written EA consent required for any works within 8m of river bank • There should be no built development on top of the culvert on site. • The opportunity should be taken to open up the watercourse, which could provide a green corridor with associated amenity and wildlife benefits • Site is at risk of flooding - site specific flood risk assessment and FRAS sequential test required. • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern at the impact on existing business (DG warping) of proposals • Difficult to comment on in the absence of more detail. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Development Principles accompanying the ‘Preferred Option’ allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area and exploits potential offered by watercourses, respects and enhances site context, and also addresses proximity of the site to the Eastcroft Energy Facility and London Road Station in terms of amenity of occupiers.
- Development Principles accompanying the ‘Preferred Option’ allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution, and development constraints adjoining river bank.
- Planning policy for Waterside area has regard to supporting existing businesses.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Burrows D G Warping
Mrs Hayes

DS75 Waterside - South of Eastcroft Depot

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is close to Eastcroft Energy facility and London Road Heat Station – assessment of impact from air pollution may be necessary. • Site in area of medium flood risk (Area 2) – FRA sequential test required. • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Development Principles accompanying the ‘Preferred Option’ allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

DS76 Boots

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site contains the Grade I listed D6 and D10 buildings and the Grade II* D90 building, and their significance and setting will need to be preserved through any redevelopment. • Opportunity to enhance the listed buildings as well as preserve them English Heritage would welcome early engagement in this regard. • Further assessment and justification of this site would be necessary in order to take place. Appropriate development criteria would need to be set. • Careful consideration should be given to whether re- development of this site may lead to air quality issues and introduce new |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>sensitive receptors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is located in an area of high flood risk (Zones 3 and 2). Site specific FRA and FRA sequential test required. • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource • Development must not impact on this river environment • This site isn't a 'campus' - seems sketchy-consultation on proposed enterprise-zone. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

The development principles take on board the comments made by the Environment Agency and English Heritage

List of respondees:

Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency

DS77 Bull Close Road

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site in close proximity to a Waste Treatment Facility • Underlain by principal aquifer – environmental assessment required to avoid contamination to groundwater resource • Site in area of medium flood risk (Area 2) – FRA sequential test required. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Flood risk and potential for contamination from development would be considered, amongst other issues, as part of the planning application process.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Bonnar Imperial Tobacco Limited

DS78 Medi Park

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---------------|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site is opposite the scheduled monument of Lenton Priory (which also contains the Grade II listed Church of St Anthony and a number of listed structures in the churchyard)• Any proposal will need to preserve and enhance the significance and setting of the above designated heritage assets (as well as address any undesignated archaeology within)• Further assessment and justification of this site would be necessary and appropriate development criteria would need to be set.• EA comments remain as set out in extant outline planning permission ref. 09/01414/POUT |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The development principles take on board the comments made by the Environment Agency and English Heritage.
- This site benefits from an extant planning permission and therefore the comments the Environment Agency made at the planning application stage remain valid.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

DS79 Nottingham Science & Technology Park Phase Two

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site is in close proximity to a Waste Treatment Facility• Site is located in an area of medium flood risk (Zone 2). An FRA sequential test is required. FRA required assessing flood risk to Tottle Brook.• Site should be designated for housing not mixed use – preference should be given to family housing. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- General comments noted. It is recommended that site is taken forward as a Preferred Option for employment uses as it is part of a designated employment zone.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Richardson

DS80 Western Club

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unless it is possible to guarantee that new housing will not be bought by buy-to-let investors to change into HMOs, etc. we would oppose the use of this land for anything other than green space with, perhaps, the section where the club buildings are now sited, being used for sheltered accommodation for the elderly or for a small development of bungalows, also specifically and imaginatively designed for the elderly. • Object to the designation of the site for mixed use as we believe this may open the door for inappropriate commercial and retail use, e.g. purpose built student accommodation with | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entrance from the Derby Road should be closed to traffic and used as a footpath • Under a residential development, it would be beneficial to provide some communal green space for children's playground or sports facilities as it has long contained a bowls site and tennis courts. • Would be better to stipulate |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>associated retail facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remain as tennis courts, bowling green and green area to promote sports • I disagree with its designation as mixed use. I believe it should be residential as it provides the only site of any significant size for family housing which is needed for a rebalance of the population. | | <p>family houses with no letting for a period of years.</p> |
|---|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Use of this development site solely as open space is not considered appropriate.
- Outline planning permission for a residential development of 29 dwellings has recently been granted (ref: 11/04238/POUT). The development principles carried forward in the Preferred Options reflect this position.
- Land and property ownership cannot be governed by the Local Planning Authority. However, use of a dwelling house for purposes such as a House in Multiple Occupation would require planning permission and this would be resisted where considered inappropriate.

List of respondees:

Dr & Mrs Fletcher Nottingham Action Group
Mr. & Mrs. Hall
Mrs Piper
Mrs Whitt
Mr & Mrs Beadling
Councillor Piper Nottingham City Council
Mr Ahmed
Professor Clark
Mr Jones

DS81 Farnborough School

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several residents thought this site should remain in the Green Belt and that the built development should only be within the curtilage of the existing built form. • built-curtilage/component should not encroach • at this sensitive Green Belt location | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Agency stated that there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- This site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. The site already has planning permission. It is not intended to recast the Green Belt here

List of respondees:

Mr Varley
Mr Potter
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Smith
Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council

DS82 Clifton West

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About 12 residents against development on this site, particularly due to impact on nearby Clifton Hall, Clifton Village, wood and traffic • English Heritage stated that this is a sensitive site adjacent to CliftonVillage Conservation Area and the Grade II registered park and garden of Clifton Hall. As well as affecting the setting of thesetwo designated heritage assets, the site is also likely to affect the setting of the Gradel listed Clifton Hall and the Grade I listed Church | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Agency state that this potential site allocation is located adjacent to a former landfill site but is not underlain by an aquifer and so there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing use is half agricultural |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The site will continue to be allocated but the development principles for the site in the Preferred Option of the LAPP will, where possible take on board the concerns raised

List of respondees:

Mr Varley
Mr Potter
Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (East Midlands)
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Smith

Mr & Mrs Buckley
Mr Lymn Clifton Hall Management Company Limited
Mr Beecroft
Ms Huby
Mr & Mrs Richardson
Ms Thomson
Mr Giles
Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council
Mr Lymn
Mr Clayton
Ms Lucock
Mr Ashley
Mr Ridley
Ms Judd

DS83 Fairham Comprehensive School

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency raised flood risk issues. • Local concern on loss of Greenbelt and open space | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The boundary of the site has been reduced to exclude the Washland area, this also means less Green Belt will be lost. Initial screening shows the site is located in an area of sports pitch deficiency. Prior to development the local demand for sports pitches should be explored. If demand exists replacement provision on or offsite may be required.

List of respondees:

Mr Varley
Mr Potter
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Smith
Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council
Ms Judd

DS84 Fairham House

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern raised that if retail was developed it would threaten the compactness of the existing centre, though others thought retail would improve Cliftons offer.• Concern over the possible impact of development on trees• A representation suggested Fairham House site would be a good location for an emergency services "One Stop Station".• Fairham House would be better suited to the community as a leisure facility. Then the old leisure centre would serve to be regenerated in to decent shops. More smaller shops offering better variety like Beeston shopping precinct | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little response - some favoured retail, some favoured residential• Some thought retail would improve Cliftons offer. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little response - some favoured retail, some favoured residential• Environment Agency stated that there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The development principles for the site in the Preferred Option of the LAPP will take on board the environmental concerns and the plan will have a range for the amount of retail

List of respondees:

Mr Potter

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

Mr Hallam

Mr Pugsley

Mrs Taylor

Ms Atkin Nottingham City Council

Mrs Sutton

Mrs Southern

Additional Sites

During consultation on the Issues and Options, a number of 'Additional Sites' were received. These sites, as set out in the table below, were all put forward for consultation at the additional sites stage in March 2012.

- Electric Avenue – Option 1
- Station Street / Carrington Street
- NG2 South (Alternative Uses)
- Electric Avenue – Option 2
- Waterside – Meadow Lane
- Former Dunkirk Fire Station
- Beechdale Baths and Ambulance Service HQ
- New Aspley Gardens (Option 1)
- New Aspley Gardens (Option 2)
- Guildhall
- Former PZ Cussons Factory
- Severn Trent Water Depot
- Former Coach Depot (Alternative Boundary)
- Broxtowe Country Park
- Former Henry Mellish School Playing Field 'Piccadilly'
- Land adjacent to Bobbers Mill Industrial Estate
- Salisbury Street
- Jubilee Campus

The following centres were put forward for inclusion in the retail hierarchy:

- Sainsbury's Castle Boulevard
- Sainsbury's Perry Road

A number of sites were put forward for consultation, however, they were below the 0.5 hectare threshold, and were therefore not included within the consultation. These sites are:

- St Mary's School, Plumpton Place
- Talbot House and Wollaton House, Talbot Street
- Huntington Street / Howard Street, 262-268 Huntingdon Street
- Pelham Street / Cobden Chambers, 1-5 Cobden Chambers, Pelham Street
- BGU Manufacturing, Meadow Lane, Trent Bridge, Nottingham

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The sites over 0.5 hectares and the Centres were consulted on as Additional Sites (see Appendix 3).

List of respondees:

Nottingham City Council

Freeth Cartwright LLP

Wrenbridge

New Aspley Gardenholders Ltd

Indigo Planning

CBRE

Lambert Smith Hampton

IG Land & Planning

Lenton Housing Regeneration Group

University of Nottingham

John Cawley Limited

J B Holdings

Appendix 3 – Comments received at Additional Sites Consultation Stage on Development Sites

DS85 Former Henry Mellish School playing field -"Piccadilly"

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would result in a net loss of valuable open green space in the city that is of use to the local community. • This site is identified as being important to engage people with the natural environment and help meet Natural England’s targets for access to natural green space. • Development would result in vehicle parking/ highway safety problems, including in relation to local school. • This is the only field local children can use to play in safe environment. • The field provides valuable environment for wildlife. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential development should be for elderly people or families. • Residential development should not be high density. • Residential development should match surrounding residential properties. • Strict restrictions should be placed on construction traffic. • Open space should be included within any development. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The Open Space Network in the City has been revised and re-mapped for the Preferred Option of the LAPP. It seeks to define and protect green space in the City. Policies have been included within the Preferred Option regarding loss of open space, provision of open space, biodiversity and trees.
- Satisfactory parking requirements and an acceptable relationship with the local highway network would be assessed in any planning application for development of this site
- Policies included within the Preferred Option regarding provision of family housing and design
- It is not within the remit of planning to place restrictions on construction traffic.

List of respondees:

Ms Jones Jenkins Notts Wildlife Trust
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Smith
Wells
Mrs Emery
Mr Rice
Mrs Rice
Mother Mercey Poor Clare Sisters
Mr Mardell
Mr Lang
Mrs Warwick
Mr & Mrs Haskard
Mr Pauder
Mrs Bowmar
Mr Boothby

DS86 Former Coach Depot (Alternative Boundary)

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Brownfield sites should always be considered above greenfield and open space sites. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">The site is underlain by a Principal aquifer. Due to the previous use of the site, Agency future development may have the potential to cause pollution of the underlying ground water |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | and will require careful consideration and an environmental assessment. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Comments noted.

| |
|---|
| <p>List of respondees:</p> <p>Mr Hussain Environment Agency Mr Smith</p> |
|---|

DS87 Broxtowe Country Park

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would result in net loss of open green space in the city, harming the city’s approach to climate change adaptation • This development would impact on a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, which making an essential contribution to conservation of biodiversity. • This site is identified as part of the Wildlife and as | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An ordinary watercourse is present along the southern boundary of the site, including a section within a culvert. • Potential flood risk from the blockage of the culvert must be considered within a |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>being important to engage people with the natural environment to help meet Natural England's targets for access to natural green space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is identified as part of the Wildlife and as being important to engage people with the natural environment to help meet Natural England's targets for access to natural green space. • This site is identified as part of the Wildlife and as being important to engage people with the natural environment to help meet Natural England's targets for access to natural green space. • This site is identified as part of the Wildlife and as being important to engage people with the natural environment to help meet Natural England's targets for access to natural green space. • The country park is a valuable resource to improve health • Development for short term benefits would impact on future enjoyment of leisure /environment facility. • The area is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) which should be protected. • Development would place an additional strain on local amenities and is too close to existing residential properties. | | <p>Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to open up this section of watercourse to improve the biodiversity, amenity and reduce flood risk • The proposed development falls within 250m of a landfill site that is potentially producing land fill gas • Priority needs to be given to brownfield/regeneration areas. • infrastructure, particularly Nuthall roundabout would need serious work prior to any work being carried out |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Following further assessment, this site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. Please refer to the accompanying Site Appraisal document for a more detailed explanation of this decision.
- The Open Space Network in the City has been revised and re-mapped for the Preferred Option of the LAPP. It seeks to define and protect green space in the City. Policies have been included within the Preferred Option regarding loss of open space, provision of open space, biodiversity and trees.
- Policies included within the Preferred Option seeking to address climate change
- The Preferred Option also incorporates general design, amenity, and conservation policies

List of respondees:

Ms Jones Jenkins Notts Wildlife Trust

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

Mr Smith

Ms Mee

Mr Neville

Mrs Robinson

Mrs Stagg

Mr Stagg

Mrs Huggard

Mr Hill

Mrs Kane

Mr & Mrs Toplis

DS88 New Aspley Gardens (Option 1)

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would result in net loss of open green space in the City. • The site provides actual or potential significant benefits such as wildlife, air quality, urban drainage, urban cooling (an essential component of the city’s approach to climate change), adaptation, access and recreation. • Brownfield sites should be developed first. • Allotments should be protected from development. • Facility allows people to grow own food – important as poverty increases. • Not all Gardeners wish to sell • How can development occur if land ownership is pepper potted over the site? • The land is unstable – previously used for mining | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of member / owners support this option with the smaller site (east of the road) used for members wishing to carry on gardening. • Development proposed would help meet housing need and create jobs/income • The use proposed is compatible with the site and surrounding area. • Option 1 (DS88) is more appropriate than option 2 (DS89). The development should be residential led. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If existing allotments are unused or overgrown, they should be marketed, and if plots are too big they should be sub-divided • DPD should be clearer about nature, mix and scale of proposed uses on site • Mix should complement town centre uses in City Centre, not impacting on city centre investment • Retail use here should only be ancillary to serve local need, not undermining the primary shopping area. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Following further assessment, this site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. Please refer to the accompanying Site Appraisal document for a more detailed explanation of this decision.

List of respondees:

Mr Lowe Aspley Garden Holders Association

Ms Jones Jenkins Notts Wildlife Trust

Reverend Worsnop Methodist Church Sherwood

Ms Woodall Capital Shopping Centres

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

Councillor Jenkins Nottingham City Council

Mr Smith

Ms Mee

Mr Neville

Mr Newton Pro New Aspley Gardens Committee

Mr May

Mrs Oldknow

Mr Meliou

Ms Charles

Mr Evans

Mr Stringer

Mr & Mrs Lilley

Mr & Mrs Stringer

Mr Archer

Mr Wilmshurst

Mr Crawley

Mr MacArthur

Mrs Lowe

Mr Oldknow

Mr Edge

Mrs Bowen

Mrs Johnson

Mr Baird Osborne Clarke

Mr & Mrs Robinson
Mrs Salmon
Mr Tansley
Mr Tattersall
Mrs Fleming
Mrs Marshall

DS89 New Aspley Gardens (Option 2)

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would result in net loss of open green space in the City. • The site provides actual or potential significant benefits such as wildlife, air quality, urban drainage, urban cooling (an essential component of the city's approach to climate change), adaptation, access and recreation. • Brownfield sites and regeneration sites should be developed first. • Traffic from supermarket use would result in significant new traffic and associated problems of noise, floodlighting etc. and a traffic safety impact. • Impact of development would be in addition to that caused by other nearby development (e.g. Chalfont Drive) • The gardens provide community cohesion. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is mostly owned by old people who could use the money. • The site has 245 plots and only about 25 are in use. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located in Flood Zone 2. The Greater Nottingham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should be considered when developing the site. • Future development may have potential to cause pollution of the underlying groundwater and will require careful consideration and an environmental assessment. • More people should be encouraged to use allotments. • Allotments should be Compulsory Purchased by |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once lost, this facility would be gone forever. • Some existing gardens are included within the site. • Development would reduce security of adjacent residential properties. • Retail development here would take trade away from the City Centre. • Loss of natural drainage resulting in increased risk of flooding. • Local job opportunities would be limited. • A covenant prohibits the development. • Impact to trees; • Development is economically motivated,, rather than environmentally. • Existing owner of allotments and do not intend to sell • Concerned that there are mine shafts beneath the site. • No complementary retail, service or community uses near the site, so would form a stand alone store drawing trade from existing centres. | | <p>the City Council as they are not being used for the purpose they were intended for. They are becoming a dumping ground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should be residential led and any class A retail should serve only local need. • The sale of comparison goods should be restricted to protect the retail uses within the primary shopping area and designated centres. • Some residents on Chalfont Drive, Trentham Drive and Trentham Gardens own allotments which adjoin their gardens. Should the site be developed I would request that the boundary for the site be located at a distance from the homes on these roads which would enable those residents to keep their allotments. |
|---|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Following further assessment, this site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. Please refer to the accompanying Site Appraisal document for a more detailed explanation of this decision.

List of respondees:

Ms Jones Jenkins Notts Wildlife Trust
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Ms Mee
Mr Neville
Mr Newton Pro New Aspley Gardens Committee
Mr & Mrs Nutt
Mrs Oldknow
Ms Charles
Mr Ishaq
Mr Evans
Mr Rowe
Mr & Mrs Lilley
Mr & Mrs Stringer
Mr & Mrs Trout
Mr Archer
Mr Crawley
Mrs Lowe
Mr Terrey
Mr & Mrs Taylor
Mr Johnson
Mr Tariq

Mr Oldknow
Mrs Bowen
Ms Akhtar
Mr Baird **Osborne Clarke**
Mr Plant
Mr & Mrs Robinson
Mrs Salmon
Mr Tansley
Mrs Marshall
Mrs Johnson

DS90 Beechdale Baths and Ambulance Service HQ

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed closure of the government buildings on Chalfont Drive and their replacement with housing means people will expect local facilities such as a sports centre and a children's play centre. The local library has already been closed. A replacement two miles away is no good. • Beechdale Baths is a well used facility, not just a good sports centre but a children's play area. • If developed as a food store, the increase in road traffic would put extra strain on an already busy route. It will give unfair competition to local retailers • Impact of student development on residential | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is well located in relation to Jubilee Action Group on Campus. Also walking distance from Raleigh Park and the former Chettles Yard site. • A development could incorporate both uses, both a food store on the ground floor and student accommodation on the first and any subsequent floors • University of Nottingham would support the provision of high quality student accommodation where pedestrian and transport links are appropriate and where retail facilities are available. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPD should be clearer about nature, mix and scale of proposed uses on site. Mix should complement town centre uses in City Centre, not impacting on city centre investment. • The site is underlain by Principal aquifer. • Future development may have the potential to cause pollution of the underlying groundwater and will require an environmental |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>amenity and house prices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on security of nearby properties. • High rise development will affect privacy. | | <p>assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would provide accessibility/convenience of local facilities and increase job opportunities for local residents. |
|---|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option' allocation for 'A1' retail use.
- The need for additional retail use in this area has been identified within the 2008 Greater Nottingham Retail Study.
- With reference to concerns relating to the loss of the sports centre, alternative facilities available at Harvey Haddon
- Any impact on house prices from proposed allocations is not a planning consideration.
- The Preferred Option document includes policies which seek to protect amenity, including privacy and security and to avoid detrimental impact to the highway.
- The development principles for the site in the Preferred Option of the LAPP will take on board the environmental concerns.

List of respondees:

Mrs Fletcher Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Ms Woodall Capital Shopping Centres
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Brooksbank University of Nottingham
Mr Evans
Dan & Jenny (Surname not provided)
Mr & Mrs Watson
Mr & Mrs Molloy
Miss Abbott

Mrs Kelley
Mr Baird Osborne Clarke
Mr Clough

DS91 Land Adjacent to Bobbers Mill Industrial Estate

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is brownfield which is the preferred option for building • Would provide new housing • Good local infrastructure/public transport links | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located predominantly within Flood Zone 3. • the site should remain floodplain neutral, providing floodplain compensation for any loss in floodplain storage • Flood mitigation measures required. • Flood risk to the railway line should be considered within the layout • SuDS must be incorporated within the development, and Greenfield runoff rates achieved |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site falls within 250m of a landfill site and is underlain by aquifer. Environmental assessment required. • Need to bring in old factory units on edge of boundary and further use of hydro power. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option' allocation for C3 residential use.
- The development principles for the site in the Preferred Option of the LAPP will take on board the environmental concerns.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Hout D C Hout Ltd
Mr Goulding
Mr Wilsher

DS92 Former PZ Cussons Factory

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located within Flood Zone 2 and 3 • A holistic scheme in partnership with other developments in Bobbers Mill may solve flood risk into adjacent sites. • Encourage SuDS • Site is underlain by a principle aquifer. • Environmental assessment required to assess potential for groundwater pollution. • Site falls within 250m of a landfill • The development should be residential led and retail uses should only serve local needs. • DPD should be clearer about nature, mix and scale of proposed uses on site. Mix should complement town centre uses in City Centre, not impacting on city centre investment. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed retail use outside of City Centre should not undermine the primary shopping area. |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Included as 'Preferred Option' allocation for C3 residential use.
- The development principles for the site in the Preferred Option of the LAPP will take on board the environmental concerns.

List of respondees:

Ms Woodall Capital Shopping Centres
Mr Hussain Environment Agency

DS93 Severn Trent Water Depot

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An excellent site with good transport links Residential preferred use. Max two storey. Any business use should be non-industrial. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would not like any new development to consider existing residences in terms of outlook and aspect. Would prefer new buildings further away. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Transport comment noted;
- Residential (use class C3) and Business (use class B1) uses are to be carried forward as part of the site's development principles at Preferred Option stage;
- Building heights and amenity of neighboring occupiers would be considered, amongst other issues, upon receipt of a development proposal(s).

List of respondees:

Mr Smith
Mr Pacey

DS94 Salisbury Street

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous application plans for the site showed a three storey development. There was a lot of concern about this from residents as this would be close to the rear of existing dwellings and would be oppressive. The site would not attract families due to businesses and traffic on the north side. I request that the site be made available for light industrial use as was originally intended when plans were made for the redevelopment of the old Raleigh factory. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site would be suitable for student accommodation. Difficult to see how student accommodation and family housing could co-exist. Also difficult to see how family housing on this site would not be converted into Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) (notwithstanding the Article 4 Direction). • Identified for potential student accommodation, this site should be expected to relate to students of the University of Nottingham. The | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If family housing excluded, then would be possible to incorporate student accommodation above any office or research and development use. It would be unfortunate if every site in the vicinity of Nottingham University's campuses in the three wards (Radford and Park, Dunkirk and |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>University would support the provision of high quality student accommodation where pedestrian and transport links are appropriate and where local retail facilities are available.</p> | <p>Lenton, Wollaton East and Lenton Abbey) were to be taken up solely by student accommodation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is predominantly within Flood Zone 1, however, the western boundary (Faraday Road) is located within an area at high risk of flooding. The River Leen and Day Brook 2011 model demonstrates that Faraday Road could be subject to flooding in a 1 in 20 year event. Therefore access/egress arrangements should consider alternative routes to and from the development for periods of flooding on the river Leen. |
|--|---|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Building heights and amenity of neighboring occupiers would be considered, amongst other issues (such as flood risk), as part of the planning application process;
- The mix of uses proposed to form part of the development principles carried forward to the Preferred Option stage are consistent with those defined in planning application reference 09/00572/PFUL3 which the Development Control Committee resolved to grant permission;

- The use of a dwelling house for purposes such as a House in Multiple Occupation would require planning permission and this would be resisted where considered inappropriate.

List of respondees:

Mrs Fletcher Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Brooksbank University of Nottingham
Mr Smith
D Shepherd

DS95 Guildhall

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary concern is that redevelopment of the site respects the strong and positive contribution that the other buildings (for example the Fire Station and the Central Police Station) make to the local streetscape, and that redevelopment does not result in wholesale demolition of these buildings. The close |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>proximity of Nottingham Trent University and existing student purpose built accommodation nearby would suggest the incorporation of good quality, well designed student apartments as part of any future redevelopment of the site alongside retail, offices, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site is in a peripheral location. Large scale retail uses will not form part of the main shopping area. This site should be residential or B1 led. A class uses and D2 leisure should serve only local need and not threaten planned investment in the City Centre or pose a threat to the vitality and viability of the primary shopping area.• Policy should clearly state that sequential and impact testing should be required for all retail proposals over a locally set threshold outside of the primary shopping |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development on this site should not affect the listed buildings status and should be done in sympathy with the listed building. The fabric of the Guildhall should remain as much as possible undamaged.• Would like a presumption against demolition of the existing Fire station and Police station. Although not listed these buildings along with the Guildhall make a up a 'civic campus' of very high quality mid twentieth century civic buildings (including interiors).• The site could be used for academic (teaching) use by nearby University (as opposed to student accommodation for example) |
|--|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Regard to context, the merit of existing buildings and impact on the viability and vitality of the city centre will be considered as part of proposals to redevelop this site;
- Residential (inc. student accommodation), office and auxiliary retail forms part of a wider mix of uses carried forward in the development principles to the Preferred Option Stage.

List of respondees:

Mrs Fletcher Nottingham Action Group on HMOs

Ms Woodall Capital Shopping Centres

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

Mr Smith

Ms Mee

Mr Lucas

DS96 Expansion to Jubilee Campus

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should only be brought forward for development if it can be shown that the development will impact positively on the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). These sites are essential for maintaining and enhancing our biodiversity and complement the Sites of Special Scientific Interest network. • These sites have been highlighted in the Lawton Review and the recent Natural Environment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use is fully supported. Further development of this area would support additional Nottingham jobs in teaching and world class research with opportunities for improvements to the landscape/environment. Also a multiplier affect in relation to increased support services job creation and activity resulting from increased university activities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A major part of the allocation should be for student residential use. • Crucial for student housing to be built on university campuses if there is to be a decrease in demand for HMOs in the neighbourhoods around the |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>White Paper as making an essential contribution to conservation of biodiversity. The development should maintain and enhance the biodiversity interest of this site and opportunities to increase the available open and greenspace network.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are listed alms houses within the boundary which are important and should be retained. Opportunities for opening up the River Leen would be considered as part of any future development. • | <p>universities' campuses and an opportunity to restore the balance and sustainability to local communities.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently enough university development in the area and, which has already been detrimental to the adjoining residential area. • Fails to see how further development could benefit Nottingham Citizens. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is underlain by principal aquifer. Due to previous use, future development may have potential to cause pollution of the underlying groundwater and will require careful consideration and an environmental assessment. • Greenfield runoff rates and setting floor levels 600mm above the 1 in 100 year plus climate change flood event remain appropriate for this site. • The site is close to the QMC CHP. Depending on future allocation an air dispersion modelling may be required. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is totally unsuitable for this kind of development • This is not a site that should be considered due to the presence of Public Rights of Way and listed buildings Triumph House, 3 Triumph Road, NG7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should include student accommodation as well as teaching / employment buildings |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>2GA should be retained, as it is a distinctive art deco building of some character and can add some historical context to the site. There is scope for finding a new use for this building and the presumption should be against demolition.</p> | | |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned regarding the future of the premises currently occupied by Carlton Furniture. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- There have been multiple recent planning applications within the site. Part of the site is designated as land safeguarded for further and higher education in the Nottingham Local Plan (2005). Site is in use as education, employment and retail and is mainly surrounded by residential development. It is recommended that this site is not taken forward as a Preferred Option allocation, and that the existing 'safeguarding' designation is retained, as the majority of the site is currently developed and in active use.

List of respondees:

Ms Jones Jenkins Notts Wildlife Trust
Mrs Marsh
Mrs Fletcher Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Brooksbank University of Nottingham
Mr Smith
Mr Lucas
Mr Savidge Carlton Furniture

DS97 Electric Avenue - Option 1

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is totally unsuitable for this kind of development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We support this option for this site. As this is a major business park, development should be employment led. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is located in Flood Zone 2, in the defended floodplain of the River Trent. Data from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should be considered when developing the site. Could be planned, hotel (drive-thru restaurant?...) B1... , employed to avoid unnecessary encroachment elsewhere. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Business use (class B1) forms the development principle carried forward to the Preferred Option Stage for this site;
- Flood risk would be considered, amongst other issues, as part of the planning application process.

List of respondees:

Ms Woodall Capital Shopping Centres
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Smith
Mr Potter

DS98 Electric Avenue - Option 2

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|----------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option 1 more appropriate. Unsuitable for retail or leisure as out of centre. Any uses must complement town centre uses and have no adverse impact on planned investment in the city centre. Any retail should only be for local needs.• It would be inappropriate to develop a food store as does not constitute a retail centre. Opportunities for linked trips on foot would be very limited. The site is not accessible by foot to any nearby residential population. Even if links were provided across the River Trent the population able to walk to a food store in this location would be minimal. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Construction of the NET line from the Midland Station to Chilwell will link this site with the city centre, the QMC and Nottingham University's campuses. Therefore, the site could be used for student residential accommodation. Student apartments can be incorporated into buildings with other uses. In the case of foodstores, gyms, restaurants and bars, the residents of this accommodation would be potential on-site clients |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • could be planned, hotel (drive-thru restaurant?...) B1... , employed to avoid unnecessary encroachment elsewhere. • DS98's existing building ought to stay • DS98's currently un-built portion would need to be used, sympathetic towards the riverfront. |
|--|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Following further assessment, this site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. Please refer to the accompanying Site Appraisal document for a more detailed explanation of this decision.

List of respondees:

Mrs Fletcher Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Ms Woodall Capital Shopping Centres
Mr Smith
Mr Baird Osborne Clarke
Mr Potter

DS99 NG2 South (Alternative Uses)

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site could potentially result in construction of large new retail/leisure floorspace outside city centre. - any retail should only include ancillary retail to serve local need. There are sufficient development opportunities within the primary shopping area to ensure a healthy, viable city centre. To avoid confusion, policy should clearly state that sequential and impact testing should be required for retail proposals over a locally set threshold outside primary shopping area. Given potential impact of that large scale retail may have on planned city centre investment it is suggested that any retail proposals for the site over 1,000m2 are subject to early discussions with the council and sequential and impact testing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future development should consider the GNSFRA data for the site and flood mitigation should consider the residual risk of overtopping and breach of the R.Trent flood defences. The R.Leen flows from west to east to the south of the site, Recommend a FRA considers risk of flooding from this source. Encourage SuDS in new development. The site is close to QMC CHP and subject to future allocation an air dispersion model may be required. could be planned, hotel (drive-thru restaurant?...) B1... , employed to avoid unnecessary encroachment elsewhere. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Following further assessment, this site has not been put forward as a Preferred Option in the LAPP. Please refer to the accompanying Site Appraisal document for a more detailed explanation of this decision.

List of respondees:

Ms Woodall Capital Shopping Centres
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Smith
Mr Potter

DS100 Station Street/Carrington Street

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student accommodation should be specified as a use for the site • This potential site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, via a flood flow route conveyed by the canal. Future development should consider the GNSFRA data for the site and flood mitigation should consider the residual risk of both overtopping and breach of the river Trent flood defences. We consider commercial and light industrial uses appropriate uses. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the buildings in this area, though not necessarily listed, contribute to an interesting and mature streetscene. Therefore, it is urged that development does not result in wholesale demolition. • The site includes land within British Waterways' ownership and any |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should only take place on this site if listed and architecturally interesting buildings are left untouched. | <p>proposed development of this site must consider our operational requirements in using and accessing our land and the adjacent canal.</p> |
|--|---|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Development Principles accompanying the allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area, respects and enhances listed buildings and site context, exploits the canal side location and has regard to the merits of existing buildings within the site.
- Residential, office and commercial uses form part of a wider mix carried forward in the Development Principles to the Preferred Option Stage.
- The proposed land allocation would not override existing land interests and detailed appraisal of development schemes would take into account the potential impact of development(s) on the operational requirements of neighbouring landowners.

List of respondees:

Ms Jones Jenkins Notts Wildlife Trust
Mrs Fletcher Nottingham Action Group on HMOs
Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Dickinson Canals & River Trust
Mr Smith
Ms Mee

DS101 Waterside - Cattle Market

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is a well used vibrant area with concerns on any increase in regular rush hours traffic. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend that flooding from the River Trent and Tinkers Leen is considered within a site specific flood risk assessment. Consider commercial and light industrial uses as appropriate uses. Due to the previous use of the site, future development may have the potential to cause pollution of the underlying ground water and will require careful consideration and an environmental assessment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our client's ownership ajoin this site. The client would like the Council to consider including the plot of land owned by the client within the Consultation Draft for possible mixed use in the future. |

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Development Principles accompanying the 'Preferred Option' allocation require high quality design that makes positive contribution to area and exploits potential offered by watercourses, respects and enhances site context, and also addresses proximity of the site to the Eastcroft Energy Facility and London Road Heat Station in terms of amenity of occupiers.
- Development Principles accompanying the 'Preferred Option' allocation require consideration of potential issues in relation to flood risk, ground/ water contamination and air pollution, and development constraints adjoining river bank.
- 'Preferred Option' planning policy for Waterside area has regard to the need to support existing businesses.
- Development Principles provide for consideration of traffic generation, highway safety and flooding amongst other issues;
- Adjoining land considered for inclusion as potential land allocation. Although promotion of site as a 'Preferred Option' land allocation is not considered to be justified at this stage, site to be included as an option for consultation.

List of respondees:

Mr Hussain Environment Agency
Mr Garratt Innes England
Mr Smith

DS102 Former Dunkirk Fire Station

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strongly believe that the close proximity of this site to the Dunkirk flyover and the Ring Road makes it totally unsuitable for residential accommodation for key workers Bearing in mind that the site is close to the existing Nottingham Science Park on University Boulevard and almost adjacent to the proposed Medi-Park at the QMC, the site should be allocated for redevelopment as a research/commercial facility.• Would not be happy with student accommodation. Adequate provision exists.• The local residents close to the site have dealt with parking issues in the area for many years. Impact of parking on the area from proposed development would create overwhelming demand for parking in the immediate vicinity. Reference made to previous consultation meetings relating | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identified for potential student accommodation, this site should be expected to relate to students of the University of Nottingham. The University would support the provision of high quality student accommodation where pedestrian and transport links are appropriate and where local retail facilities are available. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site is defended from flooding from the River Trent and Leen 1 in 100 year flood events, however the residual risk of overtopping and breach from both sources of flooding remain, which should be considered in an FRA. SuDS must be incorporated within the development, and as the site falls within the catchment of the River Leen Greenfield runoff rates achieved from a managed surface water drainage |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>to plans for purpose built student housing. Money would have been better spent on improving the fire station. Also concerned about Dunkirk School playing field, which is sites behind the proposed site and remains a much used and valued asset to the school. Need to bring community together rather than separating it.</p> | | <p>scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The canal side needs protection and enhancement • Hotel/offices may be acceptable but concerned at possible traffic impact. • Suggest care home/sheltered accommodation uses instead |
|---|--|---|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- The existing fire station has now been demolished;
- Education and commercial uses are to be carried forward in the development principles to the Preferred Option Stage;
- Traffic generation and highway safety will be considered, amongst other issues (such as context and flooding), as part of any development proposal;
- Hotel, offices and residential accommodation are not considered preferable in this constrained location;
- Concerns regarding the Dunkirk School playing fields are noted.

List of respondees:

Mrs Fletcher Nottingham Action Group on HMOs

Mr Hussain Environment Agency

Mr Brooksbank University of Nottingham

Mr Smith

Sir/Madam

Mr Allitt

Ms Randle

Mrs Poaterfield

Mr & Mrs Randle

Ms Eley

Ms Poole

Ms Sadler

Ms Astle

C59 Sainsbury's Castle Marina

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|----------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• C59 is not a local centre but a single building which house a particular land use as a supermarket. Whilst it forms part of the overall retail provision available in the City, and within the particular neighbourhoods it is not a centre in terms of the retail hierarchy. It was not planned as a local centre.• Inappropriate to define as a centre. The site is poorly accessible by public transport and has | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If an area or neighbourhood needs a new local centre then this should be considered, explained and discussed with the local community as there may be implications for other types of facilities required to serve that area with possible alternative locations better |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>only a small population within walking distance. The Sainsbury's and adjacent retail, restaurant and bar serve a wider catchment area accessed principally by car. The consequence of designation would be to make it easier to allow a proliferation of retail floorspace in this location which would have negative impact on the vitality and viability of the City Centre.</p> | | <p>situated to meet the long needs of that area.</p> |
|---|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Site not included as a defined centre within 'Preferred Option' retail hierarchy following appraisal of role and characteristics.

List of respondees:

**Mr Neville
Mr Baird Osborne Clarke**

C60 Sainsbury's Perry Road

| Object | Support | General Comments |
|--|----------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C60 is not a local centre but single buildings | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If an area or neighbourhood |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>which house a particular land use as a supermarket. Whilst it forms part of the overall retail provision available in the City, and within the particular neighbourhoods it is not a centre in terms of the retail hierarchy. It was not planned as a local centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion that Sainsburys store and 3 nearby retail units should be designated a centre is clearly inappropriate. There is a distance of approx 150 m between set back food store and other retail units that clearly serve a different role and function to the food store. It is unlikely that there are a notable number of linked trips between retail units on either side of this busy road in the manner normally expected of a centre | | <p>needs a new local centre then this should be considered, explained and discussed with the local community as there may be implications for other types of facilities required to serve that area with possible alternative locations better situated to meet the long needs of that area.</p> |
|---|--|--|

How comments have been taken into account in the Preferred Option

- Site not included as a defined centre within ‘Preferred Option’ retail hierarchy following appraisal of role and characteristics.

List of respondees:

Mr Neville
Mr Baird Osborne Clarke