

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held at Loxley House on 18 SEPTEMBER 2013 from 2.33pm to 4.51pm

- ✓ Councillor Chris Gibson (Chair)
- ✓ Councillor Gul Khan (Vice-Chair)
- ✓ Councillor Liaqat Ali
- ✓ Councillor Cat Arnold (minutes 37-39, 41-44)
- ✓ Councillor Graham Chapman (minutes 37-44)
- ✓ Councillor Azad Choudhry (minutes 37-42)
- ✓ Councillor Alan Clark
- ✓ Councillor Emma Dewinton
- ✓ Councillor Michael Edwards
- ✓ Councillor Ginny Klein (minutes 37-44)
- ✓ Councillor Sally Longford
- ✓ Councillor Ian Malcolm (minutes 37-45)
- ✓ Councillor Eileen Morley (minutes 37-44)
- ✓ Councillor Roger Steel
- ✓ Councillor Malcolm Wood

✓ indicates present at meeting

Colleagues, partners and others in attendance

Paul Seddon	- Head of Development Management and Regeneration)
Rob Percival	- Area Planning Manager)
Laura Cleal	- Development Control Support Traffic Management)
Nic Thomas	- Area Planning Manager) Development
Matt Gregory	- Growth Point Planning & Planning Policy Manager)
Nigel Turpin	- Heritage and Urban Design Manager)
Judith Irwin	- Senior Solicitor) Resources
Rav Kalsi	- Constitutional Services Officer)

37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

38 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Ian Malcolm advised the Committee that he had an interest in agenda item 4(d) (Radford Mill, Northern Site, Norton Street) as his spouse is an employee of the applicant, Nottingham Community Housing Association (NCHA). Councillor Malcolm

considered that, in view of NCHA's involvement in the proposed scheme, it would not be appropriate for him to be involved in determining this application and he withdrew from the meeting prior to discussion of the item.

Councillor Roger Steel advised the Committee that he had an interest in agenda item 4(f) (Grove Farm Sports Ground, Lenton Lane) owing to his previous association with Dunkirk Football Club, which was situated near to the application site. He was no longer involved with that football club in an official capacity. Councillor Steel considered that such an interest would not prevent him from keeping an open mind when determining the application.

Councillor Chris Gibson advised the Committee that he had been lobbied in relation to agenda item 4(f) (Grove Farm Sports Ground, Lenton Lane) having received email and telephone contact from an objector prior to the Committee meeting. Councillor Gibson reported that he had listened to the points made but expressed no view and he considered in those circumstances that he had not been prevented from keeping an open mind when determining the application.

39 MINUTES

The Committee noted that the draft minutes had only recently been circulated and requested their earlier despatch to enable timely consideration before the meeting. The Committee confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 21 August 2013 as a correct record and they were signed by the Chair.

40 PLANNING APPLICATION – LAND TO SOUTH OF NOTTINGHAM BUSINESS PARK, WOODHOUSE WAY

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager introduced a report of the Director for Planning and Transportation on application 13/01703/POUT submitted by Antony Aspbury Associates Ltd on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd for outline planning permission for up to 300 dwellings together with open spaces, vehicular accesses and service infrastructure.

Mr Percival reported the following information and changes since the publication of the agenda:

1. That the Environment Agency had removed its objection to the application following the submission of further information from the applicant and had recommended that conditions relating to flooding, contamination and drainage be considered.

It was proposed to amend the recommendations to delete condition 6 from the draft decision and substitute the following three conditions:

- (i) "Prior to the commencement of the development a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details. The scheme to be submitted shall demonstrate and/or include:

- (a) The utilisation of holding sustainable drainage techniques;
- (b) Two forms of surface water treatment prior to discharge from the site;
- (c) The limitation of surface water run-off to equivalent greenfield rates;
- (d) The ability to accommodate surface water run-off on-site up to the critical 1 in 100 year event plus an appropriate allowance for climate change, based upon the submission of drainage calculations;
- (e) Timetable for implementation; and
- (f) Responsibility for the future maintenance of drainage features.”

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding; to improve and protect water quality; to improve habitat and amenity; to ensure the future maintenance of the sustainable drainage structures, in accordance with Policies NE2 and NE10 of the Local Plan.

- (ii) “The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to treat and remove suspended solids from surface water run-off during construction works has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.”

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface water pollution in accordance with the aims of Policy NE10 of the Local Plan.

- (iii) “If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the Local Planning Authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.”

Reason: To reduce the risk of groundwater pollution in accordance with the aims of Policy NE10 of the Local Plan.

- 2. That the Coal Authority was satisfied with the amended information from the applicant and recommended a condition in relation to former mine workings be agreed. It was proposed that condition 23 be deleted and the following condition be substituted:

“Prior to the commencement of development the measures outlined in paragraphs 3.19 to 3.27 of the Mineshaft Investigation Report (WBP474E/03/V2) shall be implemented and written verification that the approved measures have been carried out shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.”

Reasons: In the interests of land stability and safety and in accordance with the aims of Policy NE12 of the Local Plan.

- 3. That High Speed Two (HS2) Ltd had advised that given the current stage of design and current consultation on the proposed Phase Two route, it would not at this stage wish to make any specific comments on the application.

4. That Nottinghamshire County Council, as highway authority for areas adjacent to the site, had confirmed that it had no objections in principle to the development as there would be no material impact on the existing County Council's highway network.
5. That the Noise and Pollution Control section had made a final assessment of the noise report including supplementary submissions from the applicant, and recommended an alternative condition 3 as follows:

“Prior to the occupation of each dwelling the approved sound insulation and complementary acoustical ventilation scheme, so far as it relates to that specific dwelling, shall be implemented in accordance with the Noise Assessment (carried out by Hoare Lea in Feb 2013, and updated August 2013) and further supplemented by the email from Hoare Lea (dated: 05/09/2013). The approved sound insulation and complementary acoustical ventilation scheme shall be maintained, serviced and operated in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations while the development continues to be occupied. At the completion of each phase of development, as approved pursuant to condition 2, the applicant shall provide written verification that the approved measures have been installed for all dwellings within that phase.”

Reason: To protect the living conditions of occupiers and neighbours in accordance with Policy NE9 of the Local Plan.

6. That following the submission of a revised Design Code, the Urban Design Manager had commented as follows:

“The revised Design Code has made significant improvements in establishing the design parameters and principles to supplement the Masterplan and inform the reserved matters application. The document identifies three main character areas which will vary in density and architectural style and responds to both the existing and proposed open space within and surrounding the site. There is also a clear logic to the hierarchy of the streets, which will add to the character of the development. However, in places the Design Code exhibits examples that would not be acceptable in any reserved matters application. Specifically in relation to street character the absence, in places, of well designed and defined front boundary treatment, street trees and build outs. In addition whilst the Code refers to boundary walls and railings as being a proposed boundary treatment it is ambiguous that this will be the primary solution, though it is acknowledged that the rural edge character zone dictates that alternatives would be appropriate in this area”.

In response, Planning Services advised that the Design Code was considered to be largely acceptable but the reservations expressed by the Urban Design Manager on very specific aspects were supported. This was an outline application whereby the detail was reserved for consideration at a later submission. Nonetheless the Design Code formed the framework for future submissions and therefore it was considered appropriate to impose the suggested condition to ensure that the Design Code was amended so that all parties could progress to the reserved matters stage within an approved framework and with confidence. Having regard to the above it was recommended that the following condition be imposed:

“Notwithstanding the submitted amended Design Code (received 16 September 2013), prior to the submission of the first reserved matters application, a revised Design Code shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The subsequent reserved matters application/(s) shall be submitted in accordance with the approved revised Design Code unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.”

Reason: To ensure that the layout and appearance of the development will be satisfactory in accordance with Policies R2, BE1, BE2, BE3, BE5 and T3 of the Local Plan.

7. That following discussion with the applicant it was now proposed to secure the detailed design of the on-site open space via condition, as opposed to an obligation in the Section 106 Agreement. Condition 16 of the draft decision notice already required landscaping proposals for these areas, but it was proposed to add a condition to cover play and any other equipment, seating, bins etc and to include a requirement for management and maintenance regimes to be approved for open space areas, as follows:

“Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, detailed design, management and maintenance proposals for the public open space and other areas of public realm/amenity land including play equipment, seating and bins shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and in line with the phasing plan approved pursuant to condition 2.”

Reason: To ensure that the layout and appearance of the open space elements of the development will be satisfactory in accordance with Policies R2, BE1, BE2, BE3 and BE5 of the Local Plan.

8. That Graham Allen MP for Nottingham North had requested that the decision as to whether to permit housing on this site and other sites within this area be delayed whilst a more strategic approach to housing/employment development was considered. He commented that Nottingham North was a fundamentally unbalanced community compared to East and South, with massive over provision of housing and very little industry, commerce and office space. To permit housing on the Business Park site would make this imbalance even worse. A broader long-term strategy to encourage jobs and training was required in this area.

In response, Planning Services advised that the justification for permitting an alternative land use was set out in detail in the report. It was not considered reasonable to impose a moratorium on housing development in this area whilst any wider strategic assessment was undertaken and instead this application had to be considered on its merits.

9. That a local resident had objected to the application stating that rush hour traffic already caused serious congestion in this area. Creating more traffic on the A6002 would make matters worse & would also create a road safety issue. In response, Planning Services advised that this had been addressed within the report.

The Committee supported the application and raised the following points in discussion:

- (a) The proposal met the full Affordable Housing policy requirement, which should include a sufficient number of properties specifically for elderly residents. An assessment of the availability of health provision in the area had been carried out and the three GP practices covering the area all reported having surplus capacity;
- (b) The maximum financial contribution towards education provision in the area is proposed via the S106 agreement;
- (c) In considering the impact of the development upon traffic in the area, Mr Percival confirmed that a full transport assessment had been carried out and no objection had been raised by the relevant highways authorities;
- (d) The delivery of local employment and training opportunities during the construction phase was to be secured as detailed within the report;
- (e) The design quality of the detailed scheme needed to be high and the proposed condition to secure a stronger design code was welcomed;
- (f) Assurance was sought and provided in relation to the treatment of archaeology, drainage/hydrology and of the previously mined bell pits.

RESOLVED

(1) to grant planning permission, subject to:

(a) prior completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation, to include:

- (i) the provision of on-site affordable housing;**
- (ii) a financial contribution towards education provision;**
- (iii) a financial contribution towards improvements to public transport and sustainable transport measures;**
- (iv) a financial contribution for off-site provision or improvement of open space or public realm.**

(b) the indicative conditions, substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice, and the additional and substitute conditions noted above;

(2) to delegate power to the Director of Planning and Transport to determine the final details of the Planning Obligation and conditions;

(3) to confirm that the Committee is satisfied that Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 is complied with, in that the Planning Obligation sought is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

41 PLANNING APPLICATION – LAND AT KINGSTHORPE CLOSE, KILDARE ROAD

Nic Thomas, Area Planning Manager, introduced a report of the Director for Planning and Transportation on applications 13/01367/PFUL3 for planning permission, submitted by Bm3 Architecture Ltd on behalf of Keepmoat Homes Ltd for the development of 70 dwellings, consisting of 66 two storey and 4 three storey properties and associated works.

Mr Thomas reported the following information and changes since the publication of the agenda:

1. That final Highways comments had been received following full assessment, namely:

“In order to ensure that the layout of the development is satisfactory, additional conditions are recommended to ensure that parking areas are provided prior to occupation along with details of materials for surfacing to ensure that the hard surfacing is permeable. Amended wording for the condition relating to construction method statement is also recommended to ensure minimal disturbance to occupiers of nearby property and to the public highway”.

2. That additional information had been submitted by the agent to address issues relating to gas and ground contamination, in order to avoid the need for conditions relating to these issues to be imposed or to be as onerous. The Noise and Pollution Control Section was satisfied with the information submitted and suggested alternative conditions to ensure compliance.

In response, Planning Services suggested that in accordance with the advice of the Noise and Pollution Control Section, the recommended conditions relating to gas and ground contamination be removed or amended, as appropriate.

The Committee supported the application, and raised the following points in discussion:

- (a) Several Councillors welcomed the relocation of larger houses overlooking the play space;
- (b) Councillors welcomed the developer’s commitment to the provision of good quality equipment for the open space and Mr Thomas advised that discussions with the developer regarding a commemorative feature for the development were ongoing as part of negotiating details of open space;
- (c) Several councillors emphasised the need for robust fencing to Astley Drive and asked that Planning Services highlight to the developer the challenging drainage issues on the site;
- (d) Councillors welcomed the delivery of local employment opportunities during the construction phase of the development;
- (e) The overshadowing effect of trees on the proposed dwellings was recognised as a key issue. Mr Thomas advised that a condition will be included to ensure that trees

within the application site are managed. In relation to trees on land adjacent to the application site which was outside the developer's control, the Council was continuing to liaise with the landowner to achieve a satisfactory resolution.

RESOLVED

- (1) to grant planning permission, subject to conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice;**
- (2) to delegate power to the Director of Planning and Transportation to determine the final details of the conditions.**

42 PLANNING APPLICATION – SITES AT HOBART CLOSE AND PITCAIRN CLOSE, THE MEADOWS

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager introduced a report of the Director for Planning and Transportation on applications 13/01718/PFUL3 and 13/01719/PFUL3 submitted by Marsh Grochowski on behalf of William Davis Limited for 33 dwellings on Hobart Close and 34 dwellings on Pitcairn Close.

Mr. Percival reported that there had been a change since the publication of the agenda. As a result of amendments to the layout, the number of dwellings in the Pitcairn Close scheme had reduced from 35 dwellings to 34 dwellings. The description of the proposal for the Pitcairn application was therefore amended accordingly. The first sentence of paragraph 7.9 of the report should therefore read:

“The overall scheme delivers 38 affordable dwellings out of a total of 67 and therefore more than satisfies the requirement for a minimum of 20% affordable housing to be provided on site in accordance with Policy H5”.

The Committee raised the following issues in discussion:

- (a) Committee members debated the question of the appearance of the buildings suggesting that the applicant re-consider whether alterations should be made to make the 3 storey corner blocks more striking, with particular reference to the fenestration and the detailing. It was concluded that this matter should merely be raised with the applicant, rather than requiring changes for subsequent approval by either the Committee or officers;
- (b) With reference to the Force Architectural Liaison Officer's comments as part of the consultation process, it was noted that crime had halved in the Meadows in recent years. Historic problems with crime and antisocial behaviour which unfortunately afflicted some public footpaths in the older part of the Meadows did not similarly affect small alleyways used by only a few neighbours. The latter arrangement is proposed for this scheme.

RESOLVED

- (1) to grant planning permission, subject to conditions substantially in the form listed in the draft decision notice;**

- (2) to delegate power to the Director of Planning and Transportation to determine the final details of the conditions.

43 PLANNING APPLICATION – ST THOMAS MORE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, GLENWOOD AVENUE

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager introduced a report of the Director for Planning and Transportation on application 13/01515/PFUL3 submitted by Radleigh Group on behalf of Nottingham RC Diocesan for a replacement church and 18 houses on the site.

Mr Percival reported the following information and changes since the publication of the agenda:

1. That in response to the comments of the Council's Biodiversity Officer and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, the applicant had submitted an updated Ecological Report and Design and Access Statement. This had been provided to further justify that the impact of the development on the badgers was acceptable. This included a separate ecological consultant's opinion (in addition to the main ecologist used by the applicant) that the site provided very limited foraging habitat for the badgers and that foraging primarily occurred off-site. The additional emergence bat survey requested by the biodiversity officer had also been provided.

Following the submission of the additional ecological information the Council's Biodiversity Officer had provided comments stating that the revised information was a more comprehensive assessment but failed to persuade that the impact of the development on the badgers was acceptable.

In response, Planning Services stated that the additional information submitted by the applicant in relation to ecological matters built on their justification for the proposals and argued that the impact on the badgers when assessed in the context of the mitigation provided was acceptable. The advice of the Council's Biodiversity Officer was that there had been no significant alteration to the scheme and the intensity of the built development would have an unacceptable impact on the badgers' environment, which was not satisfactorily mitigated.

2. A resident on Burnbreck Gardens had raised a security concern about the badger corridor that was proposed between the rear/side of plots 15-18 and the properties on Burnbreck Gardens. It was raised that this may offer an opportunity for burglars and queried how this matter would be resolved.

In response to the security issue raised by the resident, Planning Services suggested that in the event of approval a condition could be imposed to ensure that the badger foraging corridor was suitably designed and planted to limit access.

The Committee raised the following points in discussion:

- (a) Whilst expressing sympathy with the church and not opposing the principle of residential development in this location, in light of the concerns expressed in the report Councillors took the view that the intensity of the development would have an unacceptable impact upon the badger population;

- (b) It was considered that insufficient detail in relation to the design of the church had been provided to allow the Committee to determine whether that part of the application scheme was acceptable. In light of this, an additional ground for refusal was required in the decision notice.

RESOLVED to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- (1) **the proposed development would cause significant harm to the welfare of the existing badger population on the site through proximity of the development and significant reduction of established foraging area. The proposals fail adequately to mitigate or compensate for this harm and the benefits of the development are not considered to outweigh the harm caused. Accordingly the proposal is considered contrary to Paragraph 118 of the NPPF and policy NE3 of the Local Plan;**
- (2) **Insufficient information and visuals have been provided to demonstrate that the design and appearance of the church are of a quality that is appropriate to the site and surrounding area, in accordance with policy BE3 of the Nottingham Local Plan (2005) and paragraphs 17 and 56-64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

44 PLANNING APPLICATION – GROVE FARM SPORTS GROUND, LENTON LANE

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager introduced a report of the Director for Planning and Transportation on application 13/01313/PFUL3 submitted by CPMG Architects on behalf of the University of Nottingham for 2 new sports pavilions/changing rooms following demolition of existing buildings and associated works. The application also included the formation of a parking and the change of use of part of agricultural land to use as playing fields.

Mr Percival reported the following updates since the publication of the agenda:

1. Two objections had been received from one local resident. The second email was submitted with a letter that the resident had received from English Heritage apparently in response to his request for the farm buildings to be listed, and had been copied to a number of City Councillors and external bodies, including the Secretary of State requesting the application be called in.

The emails identified the following concerns:

- Comments were misrepresented in the Committee report;
- There were overlapping issues with the wind turbine application in Broxtowe Borough Council which was pending an appeal decision. The proposal should be deferred until the outcome of appeal was known;
- No reference was given to separate consultees; as such the report lacked balance;
- No visuals of the application had been provided from the Clifton Side of the river;
- The vantage points of Thane Road and the footpath and cycle route were raised. The removal of the soil heap would further improve views of the existing farm buildings from these locations:

- The nearby Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and works undertaken at Queens Park and Ride had not been referred to;
- Tree planting should be with native species;
- There had not been sufficient time to view the design revisions online;
- It was questioned where the ground maintenance equipment would be stored following demolition of the buildings;
- The non-designated heritage assets of the grove farm buildings were appreciable to the setting of Clifton's frontline Green Belt.

In response, Planning Services noted the following:

- It was considered that the comments were accurately summarised;
- The outcome of the Broxtowe wind turbine appeal would have no bearing on the current proposal which was located on separate land;
- Heritage and Urban Design colleagues had been involved in design discussions throughout the process. An Archaeological watching brief condition would be included in the decision notice. There was no requirement to consult English Heritage. Tree Officer Comments were included in the update sheet and were now covered in a recommended condition;
- Visuals were provided from key vantage points;
- The loss of the farm buildings was addressed in section 4 of the Committee report;
- The site was not located within or close to the SINC;
- Works undertaken at The Park and Ride were of no relevance to this development;
- A landscaping condition was included and native species would be encouraged;
- The revised images were emailed to the resident as soon as they were available and uploaded to the website;
- The applicants had advised that some large plant and equipment was stored externally on hard standing areas that exist and it was intended that this approach continued, though with improved management. The storage and management of smaller items and general equipment would be managed using grounds maintenance and stores at University Park or Triumph Road, as well as office space and general stores which would be available in the old farm house, which would not be used as wet changing rooms in the future;
- The impact of the development upon the Green Belt and was addressed in the main body of the Committee report.

The English Heritage letter forwarded by the objector clarified that the buildings did not meet the high threshold necessary for listing designation, but that Grove Farm should be recognised as a heritage asset. As EH had advised in their letter, Local Planning Authorities were required to consider the significance of non-designated heritage assets and the scale of harm or loss they face, in accordance with the NPPF and local planning policies with advice from relevant Officers. This consideration was set out in Section 4 of the report.

2. That a letter had been received from Save Britain's Heritage requesting the application be refused. This was on the basis that the site as a group of farm buildings possessed a heritage value which increased with the Royal association. Edward Prince of Wales was responsible for the buildings which were proposed to

be demolished. An alternative proposal which retained the farm buildings should be sought. The buildings could be adapted and reused. Should permission be granted it was requested that high quality materials and design were used to ensure the development complemented the farmhouse and that the integrity of setting was retained.

In response, Planning Services confirmed that the loss of the farm buildings was addressed in section 4 of the Committee report. Alternative appropriate materials had been sought for the Pavilions which would be appropriate to the setting of the farmhouse.

3. As part of the August Update Sheet a further condition was recommended by the EA to require details of foul sewage to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, but this has been omitted from the draft decision notice. The recommendation would be amended to include this condition.

The Committee raised the following points in discussion:

- (a) Several Committee members criticised the proposed design of the new sports pavilions as unimaginative and felt that the proposals did not portray a significant re-design which had been requested by the Committee in August;
- (b) Committee members also made positive reference to appearance of the existing Grove Farm outbuildings and that the proposals should perhaps include lighter coloured materials to reflect the appearance of the farmhouse;
- (c) If the scheme were to be approved, consideration should be given to including a construction management plan as part of the proposals effectively to deal with contractors;
- (d) Whilst the applicant did not own the whole of the access track leading to the application site, consideration should be given to improving it, perhaps with passing bays on land within their ownership.

RESOLVED to defer consideration of the application to a future meeting to seek a significant re-design of the new sports pavilions/changing rooms.

45 PLANNING APPLICATION – CALOR GAS LTD, ABBEYFIELD ROAD

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager introduced a report of the Director for Planning and Transportation on application 13/01375/PFUL3 submitted by CBW Design Ltd on behalf of Sandiccliffe for a new car dealership including a showroom, workshop and ancillary facilities.

Mr Percival reported the following information and changes since the publication of the agenda:

The applicant had submitted further details in regard to the sequential test exercise undertaken for this development. The report advised that a 3km radius had been identified from the site but given the wider constraints of flood zone 2 and 3, which covered a significant portion of this area, alternative sites were very limited.

Furthermore the site was located within an area that was established as a hub for this type of development and the sequential test concluded that no other sites were available which met the requirements of the applicant.

Planning Services confirmed that the radius assumed in the sequential test was considered reasonable and proportionate to the scale of development. It was accepted that the surrounding area was largely constrained by flood zone and therefore opportunities for alternative sites were limited. Given that the proposal had clear location requirements, that the site was within Flood Zone 2 and that the Environment Agency had not raised any objections to this application, it was considered that the proposal passed the sequential test exercise in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.

The Committee approved the report recommendations without discussion.

RESOLVED

- (1) to grant planning permission subject to conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice and the prior revocation of the Hazardous Substances Consent on the site (reference:92/00004/HSDC) under Section 14(1) of the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990;**
- (2) to delegate power to the Director of Planning and Transport to determine the final details of the conditions and the revocation of the above Hazardous Substances Consent.**

46 PLANNING APPLICATION – RADFORD MILL, NORTHERN SITE, NORTON STREET

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager introduced a report of the Director for Planning and Transportation on application 13/01505/PFUL3 submitted by Pelham Architects on behalf of Nottingham Community Housing Association for 67 dwellings comprising of 18 houses and 49 flats, together with associated car parking and landscaping.

The Committee approved the report recommendations without discussion.

RESOLVED

- (1) to grant planning permission, subject to conditions substantially in the form listed in the draft decision notice;**
- (2) to delegate power to the Director of Planning and Transportation to determine the final details of the conditions.**