

# Nottingham City Council

## Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at Loxley House, Station Street, NG2 3NG, on 18 August 2021 from 2.30 pm - 3.28 pm

### Membership

#### Present

Councillor Graham Chapman (Vice Chair)  
Councillor Kevin Clarke  
Councillor Maria Joannou  
Councillor Angela Kandola  
Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan  
Councillor Sally Longford  
Councillor Mohammed Saghir  
Councillor Wendy Smith

#### Absent

Councillor Leslie Ayoola  
Councillor Michael Edwards  
Councillor Pavlos Kotsonis  
Councillor AJ Matsiko  
Councillor Toby Neal  
Councillor Ethan Radford  
Councillor Cate Woodward

### Colleagues, partners and others in attendance:

Ann Barrett - Team Leader, Legal Services  
Lisa Guest - Principal Officer, Highway Development Management  
Mark Leavesley ) Governance Officer  
Emma Powley )  
Dave Liversidge - Ward Councillor for St Ann's  
Martin Poole - Area Planning Manager  
Paul Seddon - Director of Planning and Regeneration  
Nigel Turpin - Team Leader, Planning Services

## 17 Chair

In the absence of Councillor Edwards, the meeting was Chaired by Councillor Chapman (Vice-Chair).

## 18 Apologies for absence

Councillor Ayoola ) other Council business  
Councillor Matsiko )

Councillor Edwards )  
Councillor Neal ) personal  
Councillor Radford )

## 19 Declarations of interests

None.

## 20 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2021 were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair presiding at the meeting.

## **21 Bendigo Building, Brook Street, Nottingham, NG1 1AR**

Prior to the Committee's consideration of this item, and with the permission of the Chair presiding, Councillor Dave Liversidge, in his role as a St Ann's Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and stated the following:

- i. the application site is in the 5<sup>th</sup> most deprived area in the City. The height of the proposed building means it will over-shadow the St Mary's Rest Garden, making a popular open space for the community less welcoming;
- ii. the proposal for student accommodation will have an impact on the locality as it will mean that 50% of the city's student population will be accommodated within the area; impacting on community balance and feel;
- iii. due to the potential for more home-learning as a result of the pandemic potentially creating a drop in student numbers requiring accommodation, was the design adaptable and able to be easily changed to create family accommodation instead?;
- iv. the design is poor, being monolithic, and is not in keeping with the history of the area or the character of the Conservation Area;
- v. as the Council is currently consulting on a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the East Side, consideration of this proposal should be deferred until the SPD has been adopted.

Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, introduced application number 21/00968/PFUL3 for planning permission by Planning and Design Group (UK) Limited on behalf of GR No25 Limited for demolition of the existing building, and development of a purpose-built student accommodation (up to thirteen storeys) with ground floor commercial units and car and cycle parking.

The application was brought to Committee because it is major application for a prominent site with important design and heritage considerations, which has generated significant public interest.

Further to the report, and in response to questions from members, the following points were discussed:

- i. the proposal is to demolish all buildings on site and replace with a building which is of a substantially similar scale and mass to one which was previously granted on appeal and where the inspector found that any overshadowing caused would be acceptable. The shadow-impact of the building on St Mary's Rest Garden will vary depending on the season - during summer months when the sun is high, there will be minimal shadow, but during winter months the shadows will be longer so have a greater impact, although this is still considered acceptable in a city environment and in light of the previous findings of the Planning Inspector;
- ii. the detailing of the proposed building was different from that previously approved on appeal and was still a 'work in progress'. The proposal contains more glass than brick and the best materials possible will be secured through conditions in the decision notice;

- iii. members of the Committee were generally unhappy with the design and detailing of the building, finding it uninspiring, unattractive and box like. They appreciated however that improvements had been achieved in recent weeks. The addition of arches at the top of the building had softened the massing and the possible addition of other design features suggested by members will be discussed with the applicant, including:
  - brick colours and possible brick in-lays;
  - more arches;
  - flue design;
  - changes to all entrances to the building to make it more prominent;
- iv. the Supplementary Planning Document is currently out for consultation and is subject to a statutory adoption process which needs to be followed. It is anticipated that the adoption process will be completed within the next 12 months;
- v. all appropriate planning applications now include a condition requiring that energy and sustainability measures requested are implemented, fully operational and signed-off by the authority prior to occupation of the development.

**Resolved that**

- (1) the proposal be approved in principle but be delegated to the Director of Planning and Regeneration to determine subject to:**
  - (i) satisfactory amendments to detailing and materials being negotiated;**
  - (ii) conditions substantially in the form of the indicative conditions listed in the draft decision notice at the end of the report;**
  - (iii) prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation to secure the following:**
    - (a) an off-site Open Space contribution of £713,452;**
    - (b) local employment and training benefits, including opportunities in the construction phase of development, together with payment of a financial contribution of £103,460 towards employment and training;**
    - (c) a student management plan and restrictions on keeping private vehicles;**

**(subject to the Director being satisfied that Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 is complied with, in that the planning obligations sought are (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);**
- (2) 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 for Planning and Regeneration;**

- (3) the Director for Planning and Regeneration be requested to compare, in light of the recent pandemic, actual student numbers in the City with the expected numbers in the Council's Student Policy, and inform members of this Committee of his findings.**

**22 102 Palm Street, Nottingham, NG7 7HS**

Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, introduced application number 20/02769/PFUL3 for planning permission by Mr Oliver Cammell, Hockley Developments Limited, on behalf of Mr Alan Forsythe for conversion of a temple (Use Class F1) to fifteen flats, and external alterations.

The application was brought to Committee because due to viability issues it is recommended for approval with planning obligations that are substantially less than typically required by planning policies.

Mr Poole confirmed that the applicant's viability appraisal had been independently assessed and that the development was not viable if the policy compliant planning obligations of £125,096 were to be sought. The development could however provide approximately £30,000 of obligations, as per the recommendation in the report.

**Resolved**

- (1) to grant planning permission subject to:**
- (i) the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice at the end of the report;**
  - (ii) prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation to secure the following:**
    - (a) a financial contribution of £10,000 towards affordable housing;**
    - (b) a financial contribution of £20,096 towards open space improvement;**
- (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 for Planning and Regeneration;**
- (3) that the Committee were satisfied that Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 is complied with, in that the planning obligations sought are (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.**