

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held at Loxley House, Station Street, on 18 March 2015 from 2.30pm to 4.05pm

Membership

Present

Councillor Chris Gibson (Chair)

Councillor Liaqat Ali

Councillor Cat Arnold (absent for minute 75)

Councillor Azad Choudhry

Councillor Alan Clark

Councillor Michael Edwards (absent for minute 77)

Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan

Councillor Ginny Klein

Councillor Sally Longford

Councillor Eileen Morley

Councillor Wendy Smith

Councillor Roger Steel

Councillor Malcolm Wood

Absent

Councillor Graham Chapman

Councillor Rosemary Healy

70 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Chapman – other City Council business

Councillor Healy – other City Council business

71 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Edwards declared an interest in item 4e, minute 77, Recreation Ground, Victoria Embankment, as he has previously promoted the scheme in his capacity as ward Councillor. He decided to take no part in the discussion or vote as a Member of the Planning Committee and left the room during consideration of the item.

72 MINUTES

The Committee confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2015 as a correct record and they were signed by the Chair.

73 NOTTINGHAM UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS NHS TRUST - QUEEN'S MEDICAL CENTRE, DERBY ROAD

Further to minute 109 dated 19 January 2011, Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, introduced a report of the Head of Development Management and Regeneration, on application 15/00056/PFUL3, submitted by Maber Architects on behalf of Nottingham

University Hospitals NHS Trust, for the erection of a 6-storey, 713-space car park, with the 7th floor area to be used as a helipad.

The Committee also considered additional information contained in the update sheet, copies of which were placed around the table and which had also been published subsequent to the agenda.

During discussion, the following comments were made:

- (i) the Committee in general were positive about the visual impact of the proposal;
- (ii) the majority of Councillors expressed a preference for a varied colour finish, while only one preferred a single colour finish, in bronze;
- (iii) the addition of the helipad to this regional trauma centre was welcomed;
- (iv) some disappointment with the lack of sustainability credentials was mentioned;
- (v) a ward Councillor commented that the additional condition requiring an assessment of the risk of the helicopters to the tram was welcomed and, while some constituents had expressed concern about the impact of the helicopters, it was acknowledged that this was a matter for the Civil Aviation Authority.

RESOLVED to

- (1) grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the report, subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice, as amended by the update sheet, and the additional conditions listed within the update sheet, and subject to the following:**
 - (a) Condition 13 to be revised as follows:**

‘Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. Details shall include details of any mitigation measures to minimise the effects of noise and vibration on surrounding occupiers. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details’;
 - (b) no development shall commence until a scheme to provide flood resilience measures is submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing and phasing arrangements embodied within the approved scheme or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;**

- (c) no development shall commence until an evacuation plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented and subsequently maintained in accordance with the timing and phasing arrangements embodied within the approved plan, within any other period as may subsequently be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;**
- (d) no development shall commence until a scheme, to include the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:**

 - (i) a preliminary risk assessment which has identified:**

 - all previous uses;**
 - potential contaminants associated with those uses;**
 - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors;**
 - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site;**
 - (ii) a site investigation scheme, based on (i) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site;**
 - (iii) the results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (ii) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken;**
 - (iv) a verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (iii) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority and the scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the as approved details;**
- (e) the helipad shall not be brought into use until a detailed risk assessment relating to the operation of the air ambulance over the adjacent tram line has been submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, any recommendations arising from the risk assessment shall be implemented at all times when the helipad is in use;**
- (2) delegate authority to determine the final details of the conditions to the Head of Development Management and Regeneration.**

74 LAND TO REAR OF AND INCLUDING BANTON HOUSE, MEADOW LANE

Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, introduced a report of the Head of Development Management and Regeneration, on application 13/02877/PFUL3, submitted by Hunter Page Planning on behalf of Meadow Lane Regeneration Limited and Canal and River Trust, for the demolition of existing structures and redevelopment of the site to form 95 dwellings, 385sq/mt of retail and cafe floorspace (Class A1/A3), new vehicular access and parking, new waterfront pedestrian and cycle path and public open space.

During discussion, some members of the Committee raised concerns regarding the brutal style, of the buildings and the lack of decoration. It was noted that the proposal was on a prestigious riverside site and would be seen by visitors as they enter the City over Trent Bridge. The committee requested that further discussion take place with the applicant to consider introducing decorative features into the design of the buildings, and provide further visual information to allow members to give further consideration to the design.

RESOLVED to defer consideration of the item to a future meeting to allow for further discussion with the applicant regarding the application, including the materials and design details of the buildings, and to request that CGIs showing views of the site from Trent Bridge be provided when the application is re-considered by members.

75 LAND ADJACENT ST THOMAS MORE RC CHURCH, GLENWOOD AVENUE

Further to minute 43 dated 18 September 2013, Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, introduced a report of the Head of Development Management and Regeneration, on application 14/03062/PFUL3, submitted by Radleigh Group, for demolition of the existing garage and erection of fourteen new 3 and 4-bed detached/semi-detached houses, associated works and a new church car park.

The Committee also considered additional information contained in the update sheet, copies of which were placed around the table and which had also been published subsequent to the agenda.

A member of the Committee stated that they were pleased that following the refusal and subsequent appeal of a previous scheme, which was dismissed due to the impact the development would have on badgers, the revised scheme had addressed this issue.

During the presentation, Councillor Arnold left the room for a short while.

RESOLVED

- (1) that, subject to prior completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation which shall include financial contributions of £35,015.64 towards the upgrade or improvement of open space or public realm and £48,197.00 towards educational provision;**

planning permission be granted for the reasons set out in the report, subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice;

(2) to include an additional condition as follows:

‘The development shall not be commenced until a definitive map of the active sett entrances, along with proposals for a buffer zone around these, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority’;

(3) to delegate authority to determine the final details of the terms of the Section 106 planning obligation and the conditions of the planning permission, including the additional condition at () above, to the Head of Development Management and Regeneration;

(4) that councillors are 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.

76 558 WOODBOROUGH ROAD

Further to minute 53 dated 17 December 2014, Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, introduced a report of the Head of Development Management and Regeneration, on application 14/02106/PFUL3, submitted by Marsh Grochowski on behalf of Framework Housing Association, for the erection, following demolition of the existing buildings, of a 3-storey building incorporating 8 one-bed flats.

The Committee also considered additional information contained in the update sheet, copies of which were placed around the table and which had also been published subsequent to the agenda.

During discussion, members stated that the redesigned proposed building before it today was infinitely better than the previously submitted one.

In response to a question, Mr Poole stated that should it be necessary, there was scope at the rear of the proposed building to increase the number of parking spaces.

RESOLVED to

(1) grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the report, subject to no new material issues being raised in response to consultation, and subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice;

(2) delegate authority to determine the final details of the conditions of the planning permission, and any new material issues raised following consultation, to the Head of Development Management and Regeneration.

**77 RECREATION GROUND WEST OF WILFORD GROVE, VICTORIA
EMBANKMENT**

Prior to consideration of the item, and with the consent of the Chair, Councillor Edwards, in his capacity as a Ward Councillor for the area, spoke in favour of the proposal.

Following his speech, having declared an interest in his capacity as a Planning Committee member, he left the room and took no part in the discussion or vote on the item.

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, introduced a report of the Head of Development Management and Regeneration, on application 15/00085/NFUL3, submitted by Maber Architects on behalf of Nottingham City Council Parks and Open Spaces, for erection of a new sports pavilion following demolition of the existing building.

The Committee also considered additional information contained in the update sheet, copies of which were placed around the table and which had also been published subsequent to the agenda.

During discussion, it was stated that this was a successful solution that echoed the design of the pavilion it would replace, although, in keeping with traditional cricket pavilions, inclusion of a clock on the façade would have been welcomed.

RESOLVED to

- (1) grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the report, subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice;**
- (2) delegate authority to determine the final details of the conditions of the planning permission to the Head of Development Management and Regeneration.**

78 142 HARLAXTON DRIVE

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, introduced a report of the Head of Development Management and Regeneration, on application 14/01968/PFUL3, submitted by Ashton King on behalf of Mr S Meah, for conversion of a two storey, five bedroom family dwelling to 2 flats.

The Committee also considered additional information contained in the update sheet, copies of which were placed around the table and which had also been published subsequent to the agenda.

Members of the Committee stated that while they sympathised with the current owners and their inability to sell the property, there was also a need to hold a strong line in areas with an already high concentration of Houses in Multiple Occupation. A

counter view was also expressed in favour of choice and an understanding that there was a demand for smaller accommodation.

RESOLVED to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- (1) that the proposal would result in the loss of a family house, to be replaced by two apartments that cumulatively could be occupied by up to four unrelated occupants without the need for further permission;**
- (2) that the property is located in an area with an existing transient population and high concentration of students and it is therefore likely that the development would exacerbate the unbalanced nature of this community and cumulatively, the impact of similar proposals to subdivide family houses into apartments would further erode the prospects of creating a balanced community;**
- (3) due to the resolutions in (1) and (2) above, the proposal is contrary to Policy 8 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies (September 2014), Policies ST1 and H6 of the Nottingham Local Plan (November 2005), the Building Balanced Communities Supplementary Planning Document (March 2007) and the NPPF Ch.6 Para 50.**