

Nottingham City Council

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at Loxley House, Station Street, NG2 3NG, on 20 March 2024 from 2.03 pm - 4.29 pm

Membership

Present

Councillor Graham Chapman
Councillor Kevin Clarke
Councillor Faith Gakanje-Ajala
Councillor Imran Jalil
Councillor Kirsty L Jones
Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan
Councillor Pavlos Kotsonis
Councillor Sam Lux (Vice Chair)
Councillor AJ Matsiko (Chair)
Councillor Ethan Radford
Councillor Samina Riaz
Councillor Naim Salim

Absent

Councillor Sam Harris
Councillor Anwar Khan

Colleagues, partners and others in attendance:

Councillor Michael Edwards - Ward Councillor for The Meadows
Councillor Corall Jenkins) Ward Councillor for St Ann's
Councillor Devontay Okure)

Mark Leavesley - Governance Officer
Tahira Lee - Solicitor
Rob Percival) Area Planning Manager
Martin Poole)
Paul Seddon - Director of Planning and Regeneration
Nigel Turpin - Heritage and Urban Design Manager

36 Apologies for absence

Councillor Harris) no reason given
Councillor A Khan)

36 Apologies for absence

Councillor Harris) no reason given
Councillor A Khan)

37 Declarations of interests

None.

38 Minutes

The Committee agreed the minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2024 as a correct record and they were signed by the Chair.

39 Franciscan Friary, Gordon Road, Nottingham, NG3 2LG

Prior to consideration of the item, Councillors Corral Jenkins and Devontay Okure addressed the Committee in their capacity as wards councillors and made the following comments:

- a) following the decision at the last Planning meeting, work is now underway, so a contravention should take place to allow for the work done so far to be checked for compliancy with the revised application before Committee today;
- b) local residents are against the proposal, but not against vulnerable people, as they feel the change of use is inappropriate for the community;
- c) the application location is lacking 'thought' and not appropriate as there are 2 off-licences, a public house and 2 schools in very close proximity to the site;
- d) women in the local area already feel unsafe, so some potential residents of the proposal could add to that fear;
- e) there are 7 residents proposed for the building, but that could lead to many more with friends, potentially causing anti-social behaviour outside the premises.

Further to minute 35 dated 21 February 2024, Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, presented application 23/02071/PFUL3 by Denis Tully, Emmanuel House Support Centre, for a change of use from a 7-bed Friary to a 7-bed accommodation for vulnerable adults and erection of a 3mt boundary fence.

A presentation was made, including indicative images of the proposal, and Mr Poole stated the following:

- f) the application has been brought back to Committee as it has raised significant local interest, for clarification of matters of fact, and following receipt of further representations;
- g) the accommodation would be for use by low-level needs homeless people, and there would be a person on site at all times to assist with housing management and general support;
- h) there would also be case workers attending Monday to Friday to help residents with housing access, benefits, work, and other services;
- i) the adjacent church would still be used for worshipping several times per week, with an average congregation of 200 people on a Sunday;
- j) while on the same site, due to a 3mt high boundary fence separating the converted Friary and the church there will be no direct access between them.

In response to questions and comments from members, Mr Poole stated the following additional information:

- k) the Committee's decision made today would supersede the decision made at the February meeting;
- l) the Management Plan (as detailed in the report) would be enforced by the City Council as Planning Authority, and could only be amended following a written request to, and subsequent approval from, the Planning Authority;
- m) Emmanuel House is a registered charity, with years of experience. However, if there were any future issues, local residents could contact the Council to complain;
- n) the on-site person would have responsibility for management of the accommodation both internally and externally.

Resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions substantially in the form listed in the draft decision notice at the end of the report, with power to determine the final details of the conditions being delegated to the Director of Planning and Transport.

Councillor Clarke requested that his abstention from voting on the proposals be recorded.

40 Waterway House, Waterway Street, Nottingham, NG2 3DY

Prior to consideration of the item, Councillor Michael Edwards addressed the Committee in his capacity as a ward councillor and made the following comments:

- a) consultation with the Meadows community, who regard development south of the railway as an attempt to cut the Meadows off, has not been to the same extent of some other developments. Although it is recognised that there have been some successful developments in this area, such as The Barnham;
- b) more historic developments that help to enclose Crocus Square have been disappointing, such as Picture Works (now old and with a failed render finish) and Masson House (newer build, but pill box like, with slight changes in brick colour);
- c) the site is significant due to the slow running of trams as they turn the corner and its presence on a high-profile junction, but this proposal is brutal, just a large square block with no curves, especially the north elevation and east elevation (on Newthorpe Street);
- d) it is a 'poor neighbour' to the recently converted and occupied Station House;
- e) while officers have developed the ideas ventured in November, with progress made on balconies, entrances, and brick pattern, could more architectural tricks be employed to break up the bulkiness of the building, such as chamfered corners;

- f) there are concerns about the bricks in terms of their colour and variation in tone - how might road pollution impact light brick and will it soon become dowdy if we use light brick – in line with most other developments around the area , red brick must be used;
- g) on the CGI, the similarity of elevations, despite the different orientations to the sun during the day, suggests environmental opportunities have not been explored;
- h) streetlights outside the entrance (as shown on the CGI) seem unrealistic and need checking - how will light be managed, and more generally, has consideration been given to how it will look at night.
- i) this is an opportunity for the Committee to have an outstanding building on a genuine gateway to the city.

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, presented application 23/01897/PFUL3 by Rainier Developments (Nottingham) Ltd for demolition of the existing Waterway House building and site clearance, and construction of a new build development comprising a single residential block of 122x 1-bed and 69x 2-bed apartments, stepping down from 8 storeys on the frontage on Crocus Street to 3 storeys adjacent to Meadows Way, amenity space (Use Class C3) and associated works, and including 26 car parking spaces, cycle parking and other associated works.

A presentation was made, which included indicative images of the proposal and, in response to questions and comments from members, Mr Percival stated the following:

- j) following a thorough viability assessment, it has been concluded that the development is insufficiently viable to meet S106 requirements, therefore recommendation 2.1(i) of the report is being removed;
- k) the car park includes EV charging points and PV panels are to be provided on the roof of the building;
- l) the use of variegated bricks will be recommended to the developers, with use of darker bricks at the bottom and lighter ones towards the top;
- m) the proposed square footprint is in response to the shape of the site, but the scale and form of the building has been varied to respond to its wider context;
- n) design detail is an on-going matter for negotiation that will be discussed further with the developer and secured through condition, along the specific details of the bricks and other materials.

Resolved

- (1) to grant planning permission for the reasons as set out in the report, subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice at the end of the report;**

- (2) that power to determine the final details of both the terms of the Planning Obligation and the conditions of planning permission be delegated to the Director of Planning and Transport;**
- (3) that the Committee were satisfied that Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 had been complied with, in that the planning obligations sought were (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, (b) directly related to the development, and (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.**

Councillor Clarke requested that his vote against the proposals be recorded.