

## NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

### PLANNING COMMITTEE

**MINUTES of the meeting held at Ground Floor Committee Room - Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG on 20 July 2016 from 14.30 - 16.10**

#### **Membership**

##### Present

Councillor Chris Gibson (Chair)  
Councillor Cat Arnold (Vice Chair)  
(for minutes 13 until part way through minute 20)  
Councillor Graham Chapman  
Councillor Azad Choudhry  
(from part way through minute 16 to minute 21)  
Councillor Alan Clark  
Councillor Michael Edwards  
Councillor Rosemary Healy  
Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan  
Councillor Sally Longford  
Councillor Wendy Smith  
Councillor Malcolm Wood  
Councillor Linda Woodings  
Councillor Steve Young  
Councillor Andrew Rule

##### Absent

Councillor Brian Parbutt  
Councillor Josh Cook

#### **Colleagues, partners and others in attendance:**

Paul Seddon	- Chief Planner
Rob Percival	- Area Planning Manager
Martin Poole	- Area Planning Manager
Tamazin Wilson	- Legal Advisor
Catherine Ziane-Pryor	- Governance Officer

#### **13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Josh Cook (leave)  
Councillor Brian Parbutt (health)

#### **13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Josh Cook (leave)  
Councillor Brian Parbutt (health)

#### **14 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Although not required to do so, Councillor Wendy Smith informed the Committee that she had previously organised a petition for an Aldi store to be sited in the Bilborough area. Although the application detailed in minute 16 was not on the preferred site, she did not feel that this would prejudice in any way her consideration of the application.

## **15 MINUTES**

Subject to Councillor Wendy Smith being listed as in attendance, the minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2016 were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

## **16 LAND SOUTH OF 1 HORIZON PLACE, MELLORS WAY**

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, introduced the report and application number 16/01020/PFUL3 by Aspbury Planning Ltd on behalf of WBD, Aldi & Greene King for a convenience store (class A1) and pub/restaurant (class A3/A4) with associated access, parking, pedestrian and cycle routes and other related works.

The application is brought to Committee because officers are recommending that the application be granted, which represents a departure from the Development Plan which identifies the land for employment development.

Since the initial classification of the land, nearly 20,000 m<sup>2</sup> of office space has been built. However, there has been a trend for business' requiring office space to prefer sites nearer to the City Centre. Although the site is located within Nottingham Business Park, an adjoining residential development of approximately 290 properties is under way.

It is predicted that if this application is successful, it will provide approximately 205 job opportunities during construction and approximately 110 job opportunities once the site is in operation.

A retail assessment has been undertaken and concluded that this proposal is acceptable in this area of the City.

Rob Percival delivered a brief presentation which included an aerial view of the site and CGI elevations and street views of the proposed development.

Members of the Committee commented as follows:

- (a) although initially uncomfortable with the nearby residential development and the proposal to change use of land allocated for a sophisticated business park, the village type appearance of the application and residential development is very much welcomed, particularly this application as there is an obvious lack of amenities for the residents of the new development;
- (b) public transport links must be provided for the residential development and application site to ensure citizens from neighbouring areas can access amenities;
- (c) further consideration to camouflaging the car parks with sensitive soft landscaping is required.

It is noted that although public transport to the Business Park is acknowledged as poor, within the Section 106 conditions for the residential development, a condition for public transport provision was included so once the development is complete, access from neighbouring areas will be much improved.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) to grant planning permission subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice;**
- (2) for power to determine the final details of the conditions to be delegated to the Chief Planner.**

## **17 FORMER BLENHEIM ALLOTMENTS, BULWELL**

Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, introduced application number 16/01055/PVAR3 by Chinook Sciences Ltd for an Energy from waste facility (160,000 tonnes of waste per annum capacity), manufacturing, research and development facility and associated offices'. Variation of condition S1 (plans) of planning permission reference 13/03051/PMFUL3.

The application is brought to Committee because it involves revisions to a major development of strategic importance and local interest.

Martin Poole delivered a brief presentation which included a comparison of the application plan submitted with 13/03051/PMFUL3 which was granted in July 2014 (June 2014 approved scheme) and the proposed amended application plan on the current variation application, along with site CGI aerial and street level images of the previously approved and current proposals, including a predicted '10 years' time' CGI image of how revised landscaping will soften the view of the scheme.

Amendments to the June 2014 approved scheme are required to enable the facility to achieve an R1 Status from the Environment Agency.

It is noted that objections are summarised within the report and also the update sheet which responds to some of the issues raised.

Members' questions were responded to as follows:

- (a) the initial application was for a gasification plant to extract gas from waste. The underlying process for this application is the same but gas is used in a different way and there are no plans to store gas on the site;
- (b) the increased height of the chimney is required to meet the conditions of the Environment Agency.

Members of the Committee commented that the revised design is bulkier and even less attractive than the June 2014 approved scheme, but that it is acceptable Members commented that, looking at the predicted '10 years' time' CGI even in 10 years' time, the proposed landscaping will not screen the building.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) that the requirements of Part 2 of Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 are satisfied by reason of the Environmental Statement submitted in support of the application including at least the following information:**

- (a) a description of the development comprising information on the site, design and size of the development;**

- (b) a description of the measures envisaged in order to avoid, reduce and, if possible remedy significant adverse effects;
  - (c) the data required to identify and assess the main effects the scheme is likely to have on the environment;
  - (d) an outline of the main alternatives studied by the applicant and an indication of the main reasons for rejecting these, taking into account the environmental effects;
  - (e) a non-technical summary of the information provided under (a) to (d) above.
- (2) that the implications of the development addressed in the Environmental Statement subject to the mitigation measures proposed do not amount to major adverse effects or main effects or other adverse impacts that would justify the refusal of the application;
- (3) that in making the decision on this application, the environmental information being the Environmental Statement and the representations received on it have been taken into account. The Environmental Statement meets the minimum requirements of Part 2 of Schedule 4 to the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 and is sufficient having regard to Part 1 of Schedule 4 to those Regulations;
- (4) that Regulation 24(1) of the Environment Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 be complied with as soon as reasonably practical and the Chief Planner be delegated to undertake the necessary requirements, namely to notify the decision in writing to the Secretary of State, inform the public of the decision by newspaper advertisement and to place on deposit for public inspection a statement containing the content of the decision and the conditions attached to it, the main reasons and consideration on which the decision is based and a description, where necessary, of the main measures to avoid, reduce and, if possible offset any major adverse effects of the development, and also to contain information on the ability to and procedures for the challenge of the decision;
- (5) to grant planning permission subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form listed in the draft decision notice at the end of the report;
- (6) for the power to determine the final details of the conditions of the planning permission to be delegated to the Chief Planner.

## **18 VISION EXPRESS, ABBEYFIELD ROAD**

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, introduced application 16/00852/PFUL3 by CBW Design Ltd on behalf of Sandicliffe for a redevelopment to provide car dealership with showroom, workshop, used car showroom/office, ancillary parking and associated works.

The application is brought to Planning Committee as officers are recommending that the application be granted, which represents a departure from the Development Plan.

It is noted that Nissan and Audi car dealerships are already located in the area.

Rob Percival delivered a brief presentation which included artist's impressions of the proposed site, including street views.

Committee Members comments included:

- (a) it is vital that transporters have adequate access to the site to prevent them blocking the road during deliveries;
- (b) the artist's impressions do not accurately reflect the space, showing it to be larger than it actually is;
- (c) the display and sales area may only be considered small if the cars on display in the car park are considered to be 'stored';
- (d) although there is relatively little soft landscaping within the application design, from the main road the site is barely visible through the greenery of the roadside hedge;
- (e) this is a good use of the land and easily accessed.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) to grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the draft decision notice at the end of the report;**
- (2) for an additional condition to be added that transporters shall only load/unload within the site;**
- (3) for power to determine the final details of the conditions to be delegated to the Chief Planner.**

## **19 SITE CORNER OF BULL CLOSE ROAD AND THANE ROAD**

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, introduced application 16/00887/PFUL3 by Blackstaff Architects on behalf of Sytner Group LTD for a two storey car showroom and associated works.

The application is brought to Committee because officers are recommending that the application is granted, which represents a departure from the Development Plan.

Rob Percival delivered a brief presentation which included a map of the site, aerial view and road side images of the site in its current state and CGI images of the completed application.

The update sheet confirmed that a Sequential Test demonstrating that there are no available and suitable sites in areas of lower flood risk has now been submitted and is considered satisfactory.

Members of the Committee commented as follows:

- (a) the application is welcomed but the graphics provided are disappointing and any future graphics need to be of a far better quality;

- (b) this application is for a similar building in a similar location as previous applications for the same use and so is welcomed.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) to grant planning permission subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision;**
- (2) for an additional condition to be added that transporters shall only load/unload within the site;**
- (3) for power to determine the final details of the conditions to be delegated to the Chief Planner.**

## **20 14 VICTORIA CRESCENT, NOTTINGHAM**

Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, introduced application 16/00607/PFUL3 by Haven Architecture Ltd on behalf of Ms E Hipkiss and Mr L Phillips for new first floor and two storey side extensions to create a two storey dwelling and for new boundary walls and gates.

The application is brought to Committee at the request of a Local Ward Councillor due to the level of concern raised by neighbouring residents, the details of which are summarised within the report.

Further representations have been received, the main points of which are summarised and addressed within the update sheet.

Martin Poole delivered a brief presentation which included street views of the existing property and its context with neighbouring properties, floor plans and elevations of the existing property with those of the proposed property overlaid, and photographs of the view from a neighbouring property which overlooks the site, overlaid with the impact of the proposed property.

It was emphasised that the application is in essence for extensions to, and remodelling of, an existing building and not a new build application and whilst the extensions will be visible to the neighbouring property, Planners considered this to be an acceptable impact.

It is noted that the application site is located within a conservation area and Planners considered that while the proposed alterations would be more prominent than the existing building at 14 Victoria Crescent and there would therefore be an impact on the conservation area, the building would not be intrusive would not fundamentally change the overall balance between buildings and landscaped gardens. It would preserve the overall character of the area. Details of the final finish have not yet been agreed.

Committee Members commented as follows:

- (a) in addition to the formal route, residents of the neighbouring properties had contacted Committee Members with their concerns and objections but it is more appropriate for the issues to be considered by the Committee;
- (b) although the elevation views are clear, it's very difficult to visualise how the extended property will sit within its surroundings;

- (c) it is not a concern that that the design is not in the vernacular of Mapperley Park as other contemporary designed homes are within the Mapperley Park Conservation Area and add to the history of the area;
- (d) the design is too radically different to the design of the surrounding houses;
- (e) the retaining wall of the neighbouring property appears to be at a reasonable distance from the proposed application and does not to have too much of an impact other than partially restricting some views;
- (f) one of the diagrams does not appear to match the street view photograph, this puts the other diagrams into question;
- (g) from the photographs from inside the neighbouring property looking out, which show where the extension will appear in their line of sight, the application only appears to have a significant impact on a side window and not the views from the main sitting room bay window;
- (h) it is not reasonable within Planning restrictions to determine that the application is unacceptable;
- (i) this proposal does have potential to add value to the appearance of the estate;
- (j) Committee Members need to consider the impact of the application on the people living around any proposed application;
- (k) from the plans and views provided it was difficult to determine the impact on the neighbouring property so a deferral of the item to enable a site visit to take place would be welcomed to enable Councillors to make an informed decision.

In response to Committee Member's comments, Paul Seddon, Chief Planner, informed the Committee that as the application was essentially an extension, Planning Colleagues would not expect the same quantity, quality and format of graphics to be presented to Committee as some of the larger and new build applications and that the information provided had exceeded what would usually be expected for an application of this type.

**RESOLVED to defer a decision on the application pending a site visit to enable Committee Members to better understand the potential impact on neighbouring properties and how the building will sit within its surroundings.**

**21    79 HOLGATE ROAD, NOTTINGHAM**

This application has now been withdrawn at the request of the agent.