

## **Appendix 1**

### **List of main issues and changes proposed to the Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document (Local Plan Part 2), Submission Version.**

The changes are included in the Submission version of the Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document and in the Schedule of Submission Changes to the Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document.

Note that this is not a complete list of proposed changes to the Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document. A complete list can be found in the Schedule of Submission Changes at [www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/submission](http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/submission).

### **Duty to Cooperate Bodies**

There has been a generally positive response from Duty to Cooperate organisations. Where appropriate, development principles for site allocations have been amended to reflect the comments made. For example, these principles now reflect the revised Environment Agency (EA) comments, which incorporated the latest flood risk information. No strategic matters remain unresolved, and where possible changes to the Local Plan have been made to address any concerns raised by the bodies.

### **Climate Change**

Policy CC3 “Water” – amendments are proposed which take account of new information on flood risk as flood risk models for River Trent, River Leen and Day Brook which had been updated to take account of more recent government guidance on climate change allowances.

As a result, the EA considered that a strategic approach to flood risk was required for proposed allocations of brownfield sites along the River Leen and Day Brook. Accordingly, amendments were agreed in relation to Policy CC3 and the supporting text to ensure that the redevelopment of such sites would be safe and demonstrate exception by reducing flood risk to the site and/or third parties. Detailed comments were also provided in relation to flood risk for specific sites which allowed the Council to update its Site Allocations development principles and evidence base.

### **Retail Policy**

A small number of detailed submissions were submitted on retail policy. Two supermarket operators objected to Policy SH4 which relates to main town centre uses in edge of and out of centre locations, arguing that the policy is overly restrictive and unsupported by evidence. However, no further changes are proposed as the policy is considered to accord with the NPPF and is supported by the Greater Nottingham Retail Study (2015).

A Bookmakers chain have objected to the supporting text for policies SH2, SH3 and SH7 with particular issue taken around the evidence underpinning the policy approach, in the context of Betting Shops and Pay Day Loan Shops. Research, however, on the spatial distribution of Betting Shops and Pay Day Loan Shops shows that they tend to locate in areas which experience high levels of health and economic deprivation, and so no further changes are proposed to the policy.

### **Housing Delivery**

Two developers made comments on the City's housing supply, questioning its deliverability, although no supporting evidence was submitted. The owner of site PA35 Woodyard Lane suggested that the density on the site was below what was achievable. The plan has been amended to reflect the indicative nature of the proposed housing range, however the overall housing supply is set out in the Core Strategy and is considered to be robust.

### **Housing Mix Policy**

Three responses were made regarding Housing Mix policy HO1, with broad support indicated. Some suggestions for amendment were proposed, although these were considered neither practical nor enforceable. Accordingly, no changes to the policy are proposed.

### **Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and Student Housing**

Two developers consider that the policy requirements for Nationally Described Space Standards and Accessible Housing should be supported by viability evidence, however the 'Plan-wide Viability Assessment' commissioned to support the Local Plan already provides this evidence, and will be updated for the Examination.

A Residents Association consider that the approach to HMOs and purpose built student accommodation is inadequate. However, there is clear evidence that the City Council's policy approach is having a positive impact, and is as robust as it can be given Government Policy governing HMOs. No further changes to the policy are proposed.

Two developers object to the requirement for Purpose Built Student Accommodation to provide evidence of need, however, the requirement for evidence is essential to ensure no oversupply of Purpose Built Student Accommodation emerges in the future. This approach is supported by Nottingham Trent University. No further changes to the policy are proposed.

There was objection to the proposed 10% threshold for determining areas of overconcentration of HMOs/student households as being not stringent enough in some areas, but too low for other areas. However there is a growing consensus nationally that 10% is an appropriate point beyond which neighbourhoods may become unbalanced, and therefore no further changes to the policy are proposed.

## **Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles**

Policy LS1: Food and Drink Uses and Licensed Entertainment Venues outside the City Centre seeks to control hot food take-aways in the proximity of secondary schools. Exclusion of consideration of Primary school sites within the policy was welcomed (as primary aged pupils do not leave school premises at lunch time and are normally accompanied by parent or guardian before and after school). However, two fast food restaurant operators object, suggesting there is no national basis or evidence to support the policy. Comments also suggest that the policy is unclear in relation to other similar uses, such as coffee shops. However, Policy LS1 is considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and is supported by local evidence, and sufficiently capable of assessing class A5 (restaurant and café) elements of mixed-use proposals. The policy now also references A3 use class (restaurants and cafes) and A4 use class (drinking establishments) in proximity to secondary schools which also responds to points made by representors that these use classes fell outside the policy as worded and could potentially be as problematic in relation to childhood obesity.

Representations were made in support of the City Council's approach. As a result reference is also now made to the role of the Health and Wellbeing Board in bringing together a range of organisations that work to improve health and wellbeing in Nottingham, and its priorities including improving children and young people's health, and reducing the number of people who are overweight and obese by limiting access to high calorie food intake that can contribute to overweight and obesity.

## **Minerals**

Representations were made on Policy MI1 suggesting that safeguarding of sites should be extended to include "mineral associated infrastructure" in line with NPPF para 143. Accordingly, the Council added an additional criterion to Policy MI1 Minerals Safeguarding Area, which safeguards 'associated minerals infrastructure'. This means that facilities for the storage, handling and processing of minerals and other aggregate materials are safeguarded in addition to the actual minerals.

## **Places for People**

The LAPP does not contain any policies relating to Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople but seeks to rely on Core Strategy Policy 9. However, reference is made to the Council's approach to such provision, and in response to an objection from a group representing Gypsies and Travellers, the text has been amended to incorporate their comments and state that small scale infill and possibly small scale site extensions are considered to be the most appropriate form of provision, which will assist in integrating gypsy and traveller, and travelling showpeople sites into local communities.

## **Design and Enhancing Local Identity**

Policies DE1 and DE2 were amended to take into account the government's requirement as contained in the NPPF to reduce the risk of terrorist attacks occurring by reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience through sensitive design of development.

## **Site Allocations**

A relatively small number of representations on site allocations were received, including those relating to Former School/Playing Field sites. Again, those concerns raised generally related to loss of green space, uses proposed, transport congestion, privacy, devaluation of properties and impact on local services. However, all the sites have been subject to site assessment, sustainability assessment, and have been subject to open space toolkit assessment. In some instances, amendments have been introduced to mitigate the impact of development.

Sites PA5 - Ridgeway and PA6 - Beckhampton Road have been reviewed in light of the fact that the community sports hub is no longer identified as a need in the Council's emerging Revised Playing Pitch Strategy. Accordingly, some of the housing development originally identified for Ridgeway is to be accommodated on Beckhampton Road. Overall there is a modest uplift in housing numbers across the two sites.

Site PA22 - Western Boulevard is deleted from the plan as a housing site. It is currently occupied by Travelling Showpeople who would require alternative accommodation were the site to be developed. There is no known suitable available site for relocation, and therefore the Inspector would not consider the site to be deliverable in the Plan period. Its deletion would not prevent the site being developed if circumstances change.

## **Proposed Changes to Policies Map**

A number of changes have been made to the Policies Map to accurately reflect policy amendments as identified in the Schedule of Submission Changes, and to reflect up to date information, where necessary.