



## **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, 19 April 2023

**Time:** 2.30 pm

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

**Governance Officer:** James Lavender **Direct Dial:** 0115 876 4643

#### **Agenda**

#### **Pages**

**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)

19 April 2022

#### **4b Playing Fields to South Located West Of Westbury School, Chingford Road Nottingham**

1. A Ward Councillor has raised objection to the proposal for the following reasons:

The objections go back to February 2020, just before the first Covid lockdown. It was triggered by discussions with local residents & an extensive email conversation with the Housing and Regeneration team & subsequently with the developers involved in the initial stages of the scheme.

The initial objections centred on both the housing taking up all or part of the field & the loss of urban green space in an already densely housed area. There were also objections on the grounds that while the Local Plan identified the green space for housing, the consultation with the community was minimal, given the impact new housing would have on the surrounding area. The discussions I had, by now as a local councillor, were frustration that no other options were fully explored with the community & those who were discussing the issue with me felt it was top down & excluded other ideas & possibilities.

My other problem was that the plan went from a scheme which promised 100% 'affordable housing', providing homes for desperate families, many who live in Bilborough, wanting housing that they can afford & tenancies that are secure, to a plan to build houses that were 100% for sale. A similar privatised scheme to the one that Strata Homes (who build homes 'that make the Heartbeat Faster') were allowed to build on Denewood, a stone throw away. I genuinely felt in the interests of local democracy & community engagement that the new proposal, radically different to the one in the plan, should go back out for further consultation with the local community. It can't just be economics that drive this, public open space sold outright, privatised & lost to the local community.

The other real problem for me was the demolition of four perfectly good houses very early on in the process. Almost a declaration that there was no going back. That land has been a mess ever since & probably there will be an element thinking that once a vehicle entrance is created local people will breathe a sigh of relief.

So, these are the substantive points made to the Housing and Regeneration team & the firm developing the scheme, which we want the Planning Committee to consider.

Other issues which have been raised with me include -

- \* possible Rights of Way which run across the field established over many years. Those rights have been encroached on already with the extension of Westbury School.
- \* environmental, ecological & climate concerns. Also, discussion on urban forest, re-wilding & green/climate initiatives
- \* loss of green space in an area which has a high density of housing & roads
- \* increased traffic to new development
- \* lack of information about alternative sites for equivalent numbers, but affordable, housing units

I feel local people living around the development need some help in this. People often are resigned & feel powerless very quickly, they see challenging this sort of proposals pointless that they have little power or agency. While private developers have seemingly been given a free ride in the city centre, I would urge the Planning Committee to agree a 6 months pause so that a more extensive consultation is organised to really get a sense of how much support these proposals have.

2. Paragraph 8.42 of the committee report states that All vegetation clearance required in conjunction with the development would take place outside of the nesting bird season (March to August inclusive), to ensure that there is no impact on nesting birds.

However, the applicant has just indicated that they are planning to start on site in July 2023 and will undertake vegetation clearance with an ecological watching brief.

## Comments

**1. The majority of issues raised by the Ward Councillor are covered in the committee report.**

***Regarding the issue of consultation, in addition to the consultation on the planning application and the pre-consultation exercise carried out by the applicant, as an allocated site in the LAPP the principle of the development was subject to the numerous rounds of consultation associated with the preparation of this document, over a number of years. Principles concerning environmental, green space, traffic generation and a consideration of alternative sites will have been assessed as part of the allocation process through the LAPP. The development is also to provide policy compliant affordable housing in accordance with the LAPP.***

**2. An additional condition is required to address the matter raised in point 2, to read as follows:**

***Prior to the commencement of site clearance works, details of an ecological watching brief to address the removal of vegetation during the bird nesting season, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.***

***Reason: In the interest of biodiversity in accordance with Policy 17 of the ACS, Policy EN6 of the LAPP and the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (February 2020).***

This page is intentionally left blank