

Table of consultation responses and proposed changes to guidance document:

Summary of Comments Raised	Raised by	Response / Proposed Changes to Guidance
Responses received to initial consultation carried out between 11 th November and 2 nd December 2019 on draft guidance document:		
1. Concerns raised with proposed height of 10-storey block on the corner of Lower Parliament Street & Boston Street - impacting on light, outlook and privacy for residents living in the Edge apartments	Edge Apartments – Residents (3)	Propose changes to guidance document – Reduce proposed 10-storey block to 6-storeys
2. The ‘Permeability’ and ‘Building line’ sections steer away from the creation of ‘monolithic’ blocks yet the ‘Building heights and massing’ section and the diagrams including Options indicate that an 8-10 storey wall could potentially be created which could have an adverse impact on heritage assets and their setting.	Historic England (HE) Nottingham Civic Society (NCS)	Propose changes to guidance document – Reduce proposed 10-storey block to 6-storeys and increase the proposed 8-storey block to 12-storeys which would be orientated north-west to north-east to avoid the potential perception of a ‘monolithic wall’ being created along Lower Parliament Street. Additional break created in the development block in Option 1 north of the Royal Mail site
3. Objections to building heights and massing - that buildings of the kind proposed will perpetuate the physical and psychological notion of a large barrier between the City and Eastside, including obstructing the view into St Ann’s from Hockley, that such height and mass will add to the feel of a windswept canyon on Lower Parliament Street which is already very unwelcoming to pedestrian use	Victoria Park Resident’s Association Curious?	Propose changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 2 above)
4. Massing and volume of development envisaged by the Design Guidance would create a very intensive scheme, leaving little space with which to enhance the public realm by implementing the necessary street planting and other sustainability measures or manage service functions within the site and away from pedestrian routes. The spaces between buildings of the heights suggested would be very gloomy and uninviting. Very little sunlight would penetrate courtyards of the proportions suggested.	NCS Curious?	Propose changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 2 above) a wind and sun path analysis will be required as part of any Planning Application

<p>5. The site is an area of high archaeological potential with the possibility of caves, medieval occupation (including the possibility of medieval burials) and post-medieval occupation.</p>	<p>City Archaeologist HE</p>	<p>Propose changes to guidance document – Add under Planning Requirements:</p> <p><i>“An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and an Archaeological Field Evaluation will be required to determine what further archaeological work may be required in advance of and/or during groundworks for a development”</i></p>
<p>6. This part of the city is not particularly close to any of the university sites and there is already a significant amount of student accommodation nearby. Conversely, there is a dearth of affordable accommodation to buy because most of the nearby accommodation has been bought to let</p>	<p>Edge Apartments – Resident</p>	<p>Propose changes to guidance document – change wording under Land Use to read:</p> <p><i>“A high quality residential led development scheme consisting of a mix of apartments and student accommodation is considered the most appropriate form of development for this site”</i></p>
<p>7. The residential offer in the proposed buildings should support the regeneration aspirations of Sneinton Market area and acknowledge the key role that non-transient residents can have in that aim.</p>	<p>blueprint</p>	<p>Propose changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 6 above)</p>
<p>8. Should there be reference here to the NCC’s design quality framework?</p>	<p>blueprint</p>	<p>Propose changes to guidance document – Add under Planning Requirements:</p> <p><i>“Nottingham City Council’s Design Quality Framework should be used to help inform the design and planning process of any development proposals from the earliest stage”</i></p>
<p>9. NCS is concerned that the merits of the existing Art Deco building occupying the corner of the site have not been considered. It could be adapted and incorporated into a new building on the site</p>	<p>NCS</p>	<p>Propose changes to guidance document – Add under Planning Requirements:</p> <p><i>“The heritage value of the existing building should be considered within the design development stage to assess whether the current building is of heritage value and how that can be taken into account any planning application”.</i></p> <p>The existing building is not listed or within the Sneinton Market Conservation Area. The building itself does not lend itself for conversion or to be incorporated into a new building. However, if the result of an assessment of the building suggested it is of heritage value, the design team should explore whether it can be feasibly incorporated into any development and if not it should be adequately recorded and that record should be deposited in Nottingham’s Historic Environment Record.</p>

<p>10. There does not seem to have been any analysis of the impact of such tall development upon some of the long and medium-range views around the Sneinton Market Conservation Area</p>	<p>NCS HE</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – The City Centre 3D model was used to assess potential impact on key views. Further detailed analysis of the potential impact of any proposed development upon some of the long and medium-range views around the Sneinton Market Conservation Area will be required as part of any Planning Application</p>
<p>11. Concerns raised with loss of car parking</p>	<p>Edge Apartments – Residents (2) Local Resident</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – The site is located within the city centre and car use will be discouraged to promote more sustainable forms of transport. However, the guidance identifies opportunities for the remodelling of Brook Street to potentially accommodate additional parking spaces</p>
<p>12. Why can't something more interesting be provided that will bring businesses and jobs to the area? .</p>	<p>Edge Apartments – Resident</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – The guidance identifies that proposals should also include retail, office, leisure and/or A1, A2 or A3 uses which are capable of activating the ground floor frontages.</p>
<p>13. That the additional traffic that will ensue will add to the existing, disproportionate amount of traffic that the area endures and will increase the air pollution already suffered by the local community</p>	<p>Victoria Park Resident's Association</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – The guidance discourages car parking to promote more sustainable forms of transport. Environmental improvements to Brook Street, Lower Parliament Street and Boston Street will be required including new street trees</p>
<p>14. Any new development should take its cue from the low rise and largely brick built character of Conservation area, and should consist prioritise affordable, residential housing or something akin</p>	<p>Victoria Park Resident's Association</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – Low rise residential housing is not seen as an appropriate form of development for this site due to the environment and character of Lower Parliament Street. The site is identified within the 'Tall Building Zones' in the adopted Nottingham City Centre Urban Design Guide.</p>
<p>15. The high density development will place a burden on already stretched public services in the area (not enough GPs)</p>	<p>Victoria Park Resident's Association</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – Mark Shears from Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust has been consulted as part of the consultation process.</p>
<p>16. Commercial space should complement Sneinton Market / Creative Qtr.'s existing offer and, to this end, the opportunity for 'grow-on' creative / tech office space could be explored.</p>	<p>blueprint</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – Comments noted</p>

17. An effective combination of workspace and residential space could supplement existing retail and leisure uses at Sneinton Market and help create a truly 'sticky destination'.	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – Comments noted
18. The limited supply of parking spaces is positive in that it discourages car use and promotes more sustainable forms of transport.	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – Comments noted
19. Will parking permits be allocated for on-street parking on Brook Street?	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – No current proposals but further consultation with Highways and Traffic Management will be required as part of any Planning Application.
20. The interventions should not create a rat-run for cars between Bath St and Lower Parliament St as it would compromise the attractiveness and usability of the urban realm around Brook Street – the vehicular intentions for Boston St will be important in this regard and the plans are unclear as to the intentions here.	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – Comments noted, further consultation with Highways and Traffic Management will be required as part of any Planning Application.
21. The proposed pedestrian permeability seems at odds with crossing locations on Lower Parliament St – is it intended to be used as a through-route for the general public?	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – The proposed permeability visual/physical link through the Housing Aid site is not envisaged as general public through route.
22. A wind analysis should be undertaken on the proposed massing and permeability to understand the impact of proposals on microclimate.	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – Comments noted, a wind analysis will be required as part of any Planning Application
23. The Fruit Market development's massing is acknowledged in the step down towards Brook Street although it is questionable whether the 2m setback on 5 th floor of the proposals is sufficient to offset overshadowing and / or an overbearing massing relationship. A sun path analysis should be undertaken for proposed massing and the results made available as part of any consultation.	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – Comments noted, a sun path analysis will be required as part of any Planning Application

24. Active frontage to Lower Parliament St is welcomed but Bath Street should not be a 'backside' to the development. The Boston St elevation of IQ building also needs attention with respect to active frontages – it is dead space at present.	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – Comments noted
25. Proposals for this area should include a clear hierarchy of public, semi-private and private urban realm. It's unclear at present how the spaces between the new buildings would be used / curated.	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – Comments noted.
26. The Brook St improvements are mentioned and welcomed – how should Blueprint be planning for these works in their design / construction activity at Fruit Market?	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – Consultation with Planning, Highways and Traffic Management is recommended as further detailed plans are developed
27. The desire for energy-efficiency over and above statutory minimums could be implemented via weighted metrics for scoring bid submissions. Embodied emissions should be considered alongside and equal to emissions in-use. Green infrastructure and biodiversity could also part of the strategy for the site given their importance to both environmental sustainability and wellbeing.	blueprint	No proposed changes to guidance document – Comments noted
Responses received to further consultation carried out between 18 th December 2019 and 10 th January 2020 on the revised draft guidance document:		
28. strengthen the wording around requiring a mix of student accommodation and apartments	Councillor Linda Woodings	Propose changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 6 above)
29. It is, in my opinion, much better now. My preferred option is without doubt the first one, which happens to be the most flexible from a developer perspective as allows a better phasing and selling the sites independently. The only thing I don't understand is why this option is not showing all Lower Parliament Street as active ground floor.	Local Resident	Propose changes to guidance document – Comments noted and Option 1 to be corrected to show active ground floor frontage on Lower Parliament Street.

<p>30. I still believe that the towers could be a bit higher allowing for the blocks to be five heights. This would tie with the nice project further down the street, next to Sheinton Market.</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – There may be potential for some additional height but this will need to be carefully considered to avoid adversely impacting on the Sneinton Market Conservation Area and setting of heritage assets. A variation in building heights adds interest to the street scene.</p>
<p>31. Object to the implied loss of the Art Deco Housing Aid Office and has objected to the application to demolish the building as part of the planning process.</p>	<p>NCS</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 9 above)</p>
<p>32. Whilst NCS welcomes the proposed reduction in height of the block facing the Victorian buildings on Lower parliament Street to 6 storeys, the 12 storied blocks proposed are still much too high for their context, crowding out traditional landmarks which give character to the Sneinton Market Conservation Area such as the tower of the Victoria Leisure centre.</p>	<p>NCS</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 14 above)</p>
<p>33. The suggested density is still too intensive – creating inadequate public space around the buildings for landscaping and sustainability measures, whilst building in pressures on servicing such dense developments, making them unsustainable.</p>	<p>NCS</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 22 above)</p>
<p>34. The Informal Planning Guidance still fails to illustrate the massing proposed from street level (rather than a drone’s eye view). If such analysis has been undertaken it should be presented for public comment.</p>	<p>NCS</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 10 above)</p>
<p>35. The ‘Permeability’ and ‘Building line’ sections steer away from the creation of ‘monolithic’ blocks yet the ‘Building heights and massing’ section and the diagrams including Options now indicate that an 6-12 storey wall could potentially be created which could have an adverse impact on heritage assets and their setting.</p>	<p>HE</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 2 and 10 above)</p>
<p>36. Concerns raised with proposed height of 6-storey block on the corner of Lower Parliament Street & Boston Street - impacting on outlook and privacy for residents living in the Edge apartments</p>	<p>Edge Apartments – Resident</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 14 above)</p>

<p>37. Options 1, 2 and 3 would serve to further segregate these less affluent areas of the city (Sneinton and St Anns) from the City Centre itself. The apparent physical and visual permeability marked in the proposal, simply do not translate to reality, particularly the visual. Currently, in Brook Street you are visually connected right the way into Hockley, for example, and this would be abruptly ended by proposed development.</p>	<p>Brook Street - Resident</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 14 above)</p>
<p>38. Inappropriate to suggest that even 5 storeys would not dwarf the existing properties, let alone 10 storeys. This extends to the development of the properties on the Fruit Market site which are also low rise. When the document states that monolithic block should be avoided, it appears that it exactly what is proposed in options 1, 2 and 3.</p>	<p>Brook Street - Resident</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 2,14 and 23 above)</p>
<p>39. With regard for use, even more student accommodation is not appropriate for this area of the city. There is little proximity to existing university campuses (NTU or Uni of), and what this leads to is an influx of antisocial behaviour and transient economic support of local businesses.</p>	<p>Brook Street - Resident</p>	<p>Propose changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 6 above)</p>
<p>40. Vehicular access via Brook Street to such dense development would be completely inappropriate.</p>	<p>Brook Street - Resident</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 13 above)</p>
<p>41. Something akin to the density and plans approved for the Fruit Market would be far more suitable and desirable, balancing low rise, low density and plenty of green space.</p>	<p>Brook Street - Resident</p>	<p>No proposed changes to guidance document – (Please refer to response 14 above)</p>