



Additional / To Follow Agenda Items

This is a supplement to the original agenda and includes reports that are additional to the original agenda or which were marked 'to follow'.

Nottingham City Council Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, 18 March 2020

Time: 2.30 pm

Place: Ground Floor Committee Room - Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG

Governance Officer: Kate Morris **Direct Dial:** 0115 876 4353

Agenda	Pages
4 Planning Applications: Reports of the Director of Planning and Regeneration	
d Update Sheet	3 - 6

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

UPDATE SHEET

(List of additional information, amendments and changes to items since publication of the agenda)

18 March 2020

4(a) Mechanics Arms, Alfred Street North

The attached comments (appendix 1) expressing the views of Cllr Johnson and a local resident have been received.

Officer comment:

The comments that have been received largely relate to issues that are considered and addressed in the report.

Framework's activities are about addressing and reducing the problems associated with homelessness across the city, and on this basis the proposed development is considered to a beneficial impact on community safety, crime prevention and street activity. At the locality level, there is no evidence of any concentration of such problems being specifically attributable to their existing premises on Forest Road West and there is no firm evidence to suggest that the new location will be materially different in its impact. Evidence of poor conduct at other Framework facilities elsewhere is not directly relevant to this application, since Framework's facilities cater for a range of different users and the circumstances are specific to individual facilities. It is however recognised that the facility will rely on effective management by Framework, and for any community concerns to be fed back and addressed by them as they arise. In this regard Framework have advised that they will be able to provide contact details for the facility, once opened, and these can be shared with councillors and the local community.

(Additional background paper: email dated 18 March from Cllr Johnson via Group Support)

Appendix 1

To the Planning Committee and whomever, it may concern.

Hi, I have put together further information and a response to the write up provided by the planning committee this in respects to the situation given with the COVID-19 Virus and necessity for us all to self isolate due to being high risk.

Firstly I believe it would be prudent for this decision to be postponed until Councillor Sue Johnson and myself are able to attend in person, both of whom are opposed to this application, with the former being in self-imposed isolation due to the coronavirus and myself in self-isolation due to having a child with very severe complex needs.

If this is not possible then I would strongly urge you to refuse this application on the grounds that it will strongly prejudice the current residents and be detrimental to the area based, not on my views, but rather those of the Nottinghamshire Police, Residents of St Anns local to the proposed development, furthermore it is contrary to the current LAPP.

Secondly, the absences of the councillors notwithstanding there are a number of points raised in the report by Phil Shaw (I believe you wrote this report) Director of planning and regeneration, that need addressing and for these reasons I believe that your decision today should be to refuse planning permission or at the very least for the decision to be postponed to allow for these to be investigated further.

I note that the report suggests that permission be granted for the proposal to build 16 supported living flats and associated management and trading facilities following the demolition of the public house known as the Mechanic's Arms based on this report addressing material planning considerations.

However the report does not address the previously raised objections, rather it skirts around them, seeks to simply deny their existence by not addressing the legitimate concerns of residents and is, I find, misleading.

I would like to further add that this is not just an objection out of Nimbyism residents including myself do not want something of the like placed in any core of the community. A project like this would be better suited away but not completely isolated from any community as it is important for people with complex needs to not encounter any form of hostility in their path to reintegration into society.

If I may I will address specific paragraphs in the report:

Paragraph 7.3:

The report suggests that Framework managed buildings are well managed and are not a significant source of concern for local councillors or the police. However not only does the report cite only 1 of their facilities we know that the whole reason this application has come about is because the previous council leader asked for the same facility at Forest Road to be closed due to detriment it was causing to the area. The solution to this detrimental problem is to relocate the facility in an area where the detrimental effects will be consequential and far-reaching with a larger detrimental effect than the previous facility. Indeed I believe that L.Searle an employee of Nottingham city council, himself used to live right near a homeless facility which was located in Sutton on Ashfield

<https://www.chad.co.uk/news/why-should-we-live-fear-sutton-residents-speak-out-about-living-lawless-street-1023232> and had to relocate due to the constant disturbance due to anti-social behaviour and witnessing of ongoing drug dealing within the area that himself and his wife have had the misfortune to witness being residents for over 12 years, so to suggest that there will be no impact upon the local community from this development is fallacious.

Not least because The MCN accommodation on Coalville Street in the Arboretum area is a completely different building type to the one proposed. At the MCN there is outside amenity space to allow interaction with others. At the proposed site there is no External amenity space and residents would either be inside the building or outside on the street. (There have been reports into incidents that have arisen from the local Residents) I would like to also bring to your attention the police call-out statistics for other Framework facilities which I'm certain I made the committee aware of during our first meeting, so I'm confused as to why these locations were not looked into.

PC James Walker has kindly given us these details:

Number of call-outs to these Framework locations which are from the Nottinghamshire Police.

London Road Project – **179** (although 59 of these were deemed non-attend so did not require a response).

New Albion Sneinton Road– **77** (20 non attend)

Framework, Sneinton Hermitage – **51** (22 non attend)

Furthermore, with the current situation in the Sutton Ashfield building, it has further progressed with no changes still to this date, Framework on two occasions has promised to make changes and take action this article is dated 2014 and the next article further up is 2018. Same promises no solutions.

<https://www.chad.co.uk/news/home-homeless-has-made-life-hell-residents-sutton-street-2282566>

This does not give the confidence we need as a community in regards to our safety

Which is also supposedly a 24/7 staff monitored facility.

Furthermore, the report states the occupants will move on after 6 months, but by Frameworks manager at

MCN's own admission 6 months is not long enough - "Ms Clare and her team have around six months to move people on into their own semi-independent accommodation. This, however, she says, is usually not long enough." - taken from the news article:

<https://www.nottinghampost.com/news/nottingham-news/how-people-streets-nottingham-people-3251139>

This constant change in occupants will not lead to integration within the existing community.

To further add in the community meeting with Andrew Redfern it was noted that people from the London road site would not be moved over to the new proposed site which was a major concern for residents.

Frameworks operations manager Chris Bugden states *"People usually come from London Road or Housing Aid and people come from bed and breakfasts."* Framework made the decision to mix different characteristics within one building. To mix the complex nature of potential future residents at the mechanic's arms site and the complex nature of those who live in St Anns also with anti-social behaviour, drugs and alcohol issues it causes a catalytic effect in increasing crime rates.

Para 7.4 The majority of Nottingham has excellent access to public transport and other services, but not all areas are already overburdened in the same way that St Anns is. I have attached photos showing some not all of the current parking issues we face specifically within that area.

Approval for this site would run contrary to Policy HO1 in that it would be better suited to provide family housing in line with the existing character of the local area, this would support Policy 8 (Housing, Size, Mix and Choice) and Policy 5 (Nottingham City Centre) of the Core Strategy which place an emphasis on providing family housing, including larger family housing, to meet the strategic priorities of The Nottingham Plan to 2020 and the aims of the Housing Nottingham Plan 2013-2015 and should, therefore, deliver family accommodation as per paragraph 4.13 of the LAPP.

Framework's commitment to managing the facility 24/7 is based solely on their continuing to have the funding in place to do so. i.e it is not guaranteed. As such, there is every possibility that this will be cut in line with other budgetary constraints and could, therefore, lead to prejudicing the amenity of existing local residents (policy HO4 (Specialist and adaptable housing para 2.b)

The application runs contrary to LAPP policy DE1 Building Design and Use;

1. It does not respect nor enhance the character of the local area. (DE1: 1.a.)

2 There is no external amenity provision within the development as it currently stands. (DE1: 1.b.)

3. It will not provide a satisfactory level of amenity for occupiers of neighbouring properties, namely privacy and daylight (DE1: 1.b.)

4. Given that the occupants are formerly homeless people with "complex needs", often with drug and alcohol misuse issues, it will not enhance community safety, crime prevention and street activity. (DE1: 1.c.)

5. The external storage is inappropriate for a development of this size ((DE1: 1.f.)

6. It will not assist the collection, separation, sorting, recycling and recovery of waste arising from the development (DE1: 1.a.)

7.5 locating 16 homeless people in one place, with no external amenity space, within an already deprived area is completely different from locating two or three people in one property. We would suggest that locating 16 people all with complex needs, for which we should read drug and alcohol misuse at the very least, together with antisocial behaviour and anger management issues, in one property is the very definition of over-concentration leading to a change in character for the immediate vicinity of the property.

7.6 The report states that there does not appear to be a substantial problem with on-street parking. If this were the case there would be no need for resident's parking permits and given the photographic evidence contained in my letter i would suggest that there is a very substantial problem of on-street parking. Given that the facility is also meant to double as a training facility then it is likely that whilst residents may not have vehicles, visitors to the property may well do so.

7.7 The report states that the "windows in the facing side elevation of the house are understood to serve non-habitable rooms". This is blatantly not the case. The rooms are a kitchen diner area that functions as a family dining room which is often used when her 4 Grandchildren come to visit.

Another window leads to a bathroom in which the resident of Number 78 uses as a room to store and take any required medication. Loss of light/overshadowing of the area means she would indefinitely have to use artificial lighting in both rooms at all times. One for home enjoyment purposes and well being and the other for medical needs needing sight to take any medications as the resident is also partially sighted.

Not only has the resident addressed concerns that this building will affect their current mental health state for the worse but it would require them to constantly be using artificial lighting in the home.

Need I remind the people at Framework and the planning committee the importance of natural lighting in a home:

*"Artificial **light** decreases levels of melatonin, a hormone that is created in the brain by the pineal gland.*

*... When interrupted it can impact our **mental** and **psychological** functioning, including our ability to sleep, think clearly, timing and release of hormones and also the regulation of blood pressure."*

We are now aware that the resident at number 78 St Ann's way suffers from mental health issues and has expressed that there was a lack of consultation regarding how she felt and her input which is most definitely important. The scale of this building may only be 1.5 meters higher than the original but you are only looking at the height factor involved here we need to consider the full dimensions and how it is overbearing.

Please see any attached photos for further confirmation of this issue.

Para 7.11

In December 2019 that a decision was made to grant fund £500,000 to Framework to provide new affordable housing, and this money will be used to fund this development. Indeed of Framework was of the opinion that both the Council and Framework wished this project to go ahead. This suggests that the decision was already made in December and before public consultation on the matter was obtained. I feel as though despite all the indicators of the damage that will be done to the existing community in St Anns, perhaps the most damage will be done by feeling that their voices have not been heard and this committee is simply rubber-stamping the application because it is what the council and Framework want.

12. Risk Management issues

Has a risk assessment been done in relation to the residents?

13 Strategic priorities

Whilst the development may get three of Nottingham's Housing Strategy, it also goes against the Councils Policy HO1 in terms of providing high-quality family accommodation.

Finally, I would like to thank you for your time and trust that you will do what is in the best interests of the residents of St Anns.