

Report of Director of Planning and Regeneration

40 And 42 Shakespeare Street, Nottingham

1 Summary

Application No: 21/00646/PFUL3 for planning permission

Application by: Planning And Design Group on behalf of Nottingham Trent University

Proposal: Demolition and redevelopment of existing buildings with a School of Art and Design over 9 floors.

The application is brought to Committee because it is a major application for a prominent site with important design and heritage considerations and which has generated significant public interest and an objection from a statutory consultee that is contrary to the officer recommendation.

To meet the Council's Performance Targets this application should have been determined by 22nd June 2021.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 To **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** for the reasons set out in this report, subject to:
- (i) the Director of Planning and Regeneration being satisfied on the quality of final design details and external materials finishes;
 - (ii) the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notices.
 - (iii) prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation to secure local employment and training benefits including opportunities in the construction phase of development together with payment of a financial contribution of £68,436 towards employment and training;
- 2.2 Power to determine the final details of both the terms of the Planning Obligation agreement and the conditions of planning permission to be delegated to the Director of Planning and Regeneration.
- 2.3 That Committee are 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.

3 Background

- 3.1 The application site is located at the north-west corner of the junction of Shakespeare Street with North and South Sherwood Street. To the west on Shakespeare Street is the University Hall (Grade II listed). The Mechanics Institute is to the north on North Sherwood Street. To the east is The Playwright public house at the junction of Shakespeare Street with North Sherwood Street. To the south opposite on Shakespeare Street is the Arkwright Building (Grade II* listed) and its frontage grounds, including its gates, railings and boundary wall (Grade II listed). Diagonally south-east on Shakespeare Street is the vacant former Police and Fire Stations.
- 3.2 The existing buildings on the application site comprise three amalgamated mid-19th century terraced townhouses (42 Shakespeare Street), adjoined on the east side by a large 1930 extension (40 Shakespeare Street), which forms the corner with North Sherwood Street. No. 42 Shakespeare Street is a three storey neo-Classical style building, with a rendered front elevation and painted stone dressings. No. 40 Shakespeare Street is a two storey red brick building with stone dressings that is also in a neo-Classical style of its later period.
- 3.3 Historically the buildings were in use as Nottingham's YWCA, but more recently have been in various uses including a hostel, pharmacy, and student accommodation before being purchased in November 2018 by Nottingham Trent University. The buildings are currently vacant.
- 3.4 The buildings are included within the boundary of the Arboretum Conservation Area, which also includes the neighbouring University Hall and properties to the east on Shakespeare Street before then turning up Mansfield Road.

4 Details of the proposal

- 4.1 The proposal is for the redevelopment of the application site to provide a new building for the School of Art & Design at Nottingham Trent University within their City Campus. The proposal is in the form of a nine storey building, with a main triple height entrance off Shakespeare Street, leading to a central lift and scissor stair core, and with mixed studio, laboratory, and collaborative teaching spaces on either side of this central core. The tallest element of the building would be on the corner of Shakespeare Street with North Sherwood Street, which would be defined by a projecting high level picture window feature on its top floors. The height of the building would then step down to the west next to University Hall, but would remain significantly taller than this neighbouring building. There would be a roof terrace area to this western section of the proposed building and there would also be screened elements of roof mounted plant. The overall floorspace of the proposed development would be 5,300sq.m.
- 4.2 The primary materials of the proposed building would be a profiled green glazed ceramic tile system, to be applied in a range of vertical profiles and with horizontal cornice breaks at levels across the elevations, and with large expanses of curtain walling glazing that would also incorporate vertical ceramic breaks as part of the design of the taller corner element of the building. A darker green profiled ceramic tile would be used at the base of the building. The chamfered faces of the projecting high level picture window feature would be clad in an anodised

aluminium cladding system, with this material also being used as the framing system to the glazed element of the building next to University Hall.

- 4.3 The application submission advises that “the building will bring together film, animation, UX design, gaming design, graphic design and illustration. The innovation lab enables collaborations with industry and a space to showcase the talented students work. The new building will provide dedicated spaces for Visual Communication, Moving Image and Digital Screen Arts disciplines. It will also enhance the school’s desire for more inter-disciplinary collaboration, social learning and celebration of work in progress as well as finished pieces.” The application submission also advises that “the proposed building has the potential to facilitate significant number of additional jobs, with potential occupancy of 300-400 staff. The growth of the School of Art & Design through the provision of this building will deliver an additional 107 academic staff jobs in addition to those currently within the school. The School’s growth plan builds upon the predicted growth of the existing Art and Design subjects of 1,814 students by 2025.”

5 Consultations and observations of other officers

Adjoining occupiers consulted:

A total of 44 individual notification letters were sent to neighbouring properties to the application site, including:

32 – 40 Shakespeare Street
1 – 5, 15 - 19 Matlock Court
Flats 1 – 14 Victoria Studios
Flats 1 – 8, 2 North Sherwood Street
3 North Sherwood Street
Larkdale Family Centre, North Sherwood Street
Former Police Garage, North Sherwood Street

The application has also been publicised by site and press notices.

The application has been revised since its original submission. All respondents to the original submission have been notified for their views on the revised submission. At the point of preparing this report those responses are still being received. Those responses will be collated and issued to the Committee by means of an update sheet. The following responses are therefore those that have been received in response to the original submission and are intended to provide Committee with background information in relation the range of comments and concerns already expressed:

Neighbour (Mechanics Institute 1): The proposed building will be on the south side of the Mechanics and within half a metre of our building, which will totally put our building in shadow at all times. Consider the height of the building is far in excess of any building around and not in keeping with the area. The dust and noise from the demolition and rebuild will be close to our kitchen/restaurant extractor and food storage. Many of our members are above retirement age and the noise and dust could well affect them as well as give them safe access to our building. Our largest income comes from the hire of our rooms. So the noise from the work could give problems to the speakers being heard and also talks for our own members in our library.

Neighbour (Mechanics Institute 2): Request regard to the planning of this building, its demolition and construction, which could cause the Institute, its members and users a great deal of unhappiness and turmoil for 3 years. We have a small but very useful car park for our Members which we are concerned may be taken over during the building process, so we ask that some provision be made by the NTU to ensure that if the development goes ahead we will still have a safe and secure car park. If the NTU plan does go ahead in some form, we ask that full consideration be given to the possibility that The Nottingham Mechanics would lose revenue from our educational partners who would not want to use a building next to a noisy building site. This loss of revenue could result in the demise of the oldest Institute of its kind in Nottingham.

There is also the question of over-shadowing our 2 storey Mechanics Building from a 9 storey building immediately next door. The rear aspect of our building now gets light all afternoon so we ask that this be taken into consideration when looking at planning for the new building.

Councillor Liversidge: Object to this application since it is too tall and will affect the ability of residents of Matlock Court from having a reasonable quality of life.

Neighbour (Matlock Court): The current building is worth preserving. It is in good repair, having recently undergone conversion into student accommodation, is pleasant to look at, is of architectural merit, is of a size appropriate to its plot, and is a valuable part of Shakespeare Street's streetscape and the City's social history.

It seems perverse in a climate emergency to demolish a high quality building and waste all its embodied carbon. There is clearly a need for student accommodation as witnessed by the plethora of student housing developments being built, so why allow this useful buildings destruction?

Consider that the height and sheer mass of the proposed building would be a gross overdevelopment of the plot, where there are so many alternative sites that are crying out for a development of this kind. If this is built I will lose my view of the City and will be overlooked by a large, oppressive building that will also set a worrying precedent for future developments on sites on North Sherwood Street surrounding my home. Also concerned at the noise, traffic and disruption that the demolition and construction would cause.

Neighbour (Matlock Court): Objection. I do not believe the building fits in with the surrounding area. Although there are some modern buildings in the area they do not dominate the way this will do.

It will have a detrimental impact on the other far more attractive buildings nearby eg the Arkwright building. The views North and South will be made far less attractive. The height of the building is totally out of scale with the surroundings. Giving permission for a building of this height will also set an unfortunate precedent as all future developments will seek to match or exceed this height. This building will overshadow my house and garden taking light from the rear of my property and totally changing the view. Past experience has shown that new buildings can also deflect noise and I am concerned that there may be an increase in traffic noise.

Neighbour (Matlock Court): Objection. Whilst I welcome progress on the redevelopment of these long-empty buildings, I strongly feel that the application to construct a 9-storey building is excessive. All the immediate surrounding buildings

are 3-storey or less and this development would tower over the area. Matlock Court is less than 50 metres from the corner of the existing building. The proposed new structure would dominate the skyline and, being south-west of Matlock Court, block out the sun and cast a shadow over all of the residential properties there from early afternoon until evening. Ideally, a replacement building of the same height would seem appropriate in the circumstances.

Neighbour (Matlock Court): Objection. The proposal is a threat to the amenities of my property in a number of ways. The height of the building will reduce light significantly to the rear rooms and the garden of my house. Windows shown on the east elevation will intrude on my privacy, looking directly onto my garden and the south facing rooms of the house. Views from the house towards the south west i.e. the skyline over the Arkwright Building will be impeded.

I also believe the proposal will be to the detriment of the area in general. The building's height is grossly out of scale with the surrounding buildings and will tower over the University Hall (which was so recently, and so attractively, restored by NTU), the Mechanics' Institute (which was designed to carefully blend with the existing YWCA at number 40) and the Playwright pub (an attractive 19th century building and founding home of Nottingham Forest FC). It will also detract from the appeal of one of Nottingham's most unusual buildings and one of the city's rare examples of Victorian Gothic architecture on a grand scale: The Arkwright Building. Views to the north from South Sherwood Street and to the south from North Sherwood Street will be severely impeded, making the area significantly less attractive.

City Resident: Overall support the application, but feel certain aspects of the design are alienating to the surrounding area

City Resident: I feel that the demolition of these historic buildings will be detrimental to the area. The buildings do need work to bring them back into a good state of repair but this is both more in keeping with the councils carbon neutral agenda and sympathetic to the surrounding architecture. The proposed building is unnecessarily large and will devalue a beautiful area of Nottingham. When the council is working hard to reinstate heritage shopfronts elsewhere in the city this feels like a step backwards. Surely as the buildings are in the Arboretum conservation area a better option would be to refurbish buildings that have stood for over 100 years rather than destroy them.

City Resident: Very large building that is over scale in the context of surrounding buildings. This will be over dominant in the street scape and have a negative impact on this part of Nottingham City Centre.

Whilst the style, design and finish are inevitably subjective matters, I do not feel they possess the degree of quality, especially for a building of this size and scale with the impact that will result, that the applicants seek to suggest.

This is a shame as a new art and design school could be a benefit to Nottingham. It is simply that the proposed building does not achieve that objective in my view.

City Resident: At a time when the City is correcting mistakes of the past by demolishing and greening Broad Marsh and exploring the possibility of reconstructing the historical nature of the city, this application does not seem to be a part of a co-ordinated planned, development of the City Centre, rather an

opportunistic random use of an acquired space. The building size and design is totally out of keeping with the buildings in the area, overshadowing and dwarfing the surrounding listed buildings, residential accommodation and, indeed, the University's own buildings. This unplanned approach will set an unhealthy precedent for developers and future applications disregarding the need to protect the character of the City and will have particular effect on the skyline of the City, the attractiveness and privacy of buildings in surrounding areas and possibly irrecoverably damage the historic cave system beneath the City - which the Council has taken great pains to publicise and preserve. The University would be better served by repurposing empty office space in the City, refashioning or relocating the design in an appropriate site such as Broad Marsh, the Boots Island Development or other properly planned area, and should be in accordance with a properly formed strategic development plan for the City.

Nottingham Civic Society: Objects strenuously to the proposed development, which would tower over adjacent listed buildings damaging their settings and the appearance of the Arboretum Conservation Area.

The existing buildings on the site do make only a modest contribution to the character of the conservation area but their scale and appearance act as 'polite neighbours' in the settings of adjacent listed building. The critical issue for NCS is not the loss of Nos. 40-42 Shakespeare Street but the sheer scale of the proposed replacement, both its relative height and in its massive elevational components.

The new building's design acknowledges nothing from the appearance of this part of the conservation area which is characterised by a mix of Victorian institutional buildings and residences displaying either Gothic or classically inspired architectural themes. The proposed building offers nothing sympathetic in return.

The applicant's Heritage Statement minimises this impact as 'less than substantial harm'. However, NCS vigorously disagrees with this assessment both in terms of the damage to the character of the conservation area and the harm to the significance of the settings of the Grade II listed former Synagogue (University Hall) and the Grade II listed former Registry Office (50 Shakespeare Street). The application site is not large enough for the footprint of the new building which would be constructed right up to the boundary of the University Hall curtilage. The adjacent listed building would be completely overwhelmed by the new structure which is not only three times larger in height but also projects in front of the listed building, assertively dominating its surroundings as a self-proclaimed 'gateway' as demonstrated in View 4. This harms the setting of University Hall which was designed with its impressive classical portico offset from the street and approached by its flight of steps to reinforce the sense of anticipation on arrival. The overpowering effect of the new building would challenge this arrival space, overshadowing it both literally and metaphorically.

The scale of the new building's projection into the Shakespeare Street streetscene, also damages the prominence of the Gothic architecture of the Grade II listed No. 50 Shakespeare Street with its pyramidal roofed prominent corner feature. View 2 demonstrates how this element of the setting would be harmed, obscuring the view of this feature because of the scale and forceful design of the incongruous new building.

The over-sized building cannot give anything back to the public realm in this location, having to rely on a separate site at the rear, which is not even part of this

development, thus reinforcing the fact that the building's footprint is too large for this site.

By damaging the significance of the settings of individual listed buildings, the local distinctiveness of the Arboretum Conservation Area in particular and Nottingham city centre in general is undermined, to be replaced with a building whose design has nothing to do with its surroundings and is not even unique to NTU and Nottingham (see Bristol University Library).

NCS urges a complete re-think of this proposal to safeguard the historic environment.

Additional consultation letters sent to:

Historic England: Objection. The scheme proposes to replace existing historic buildings with a 9 storey tower. The proposed demolition and replacement of the extant historic buildings at 40 - 42 Shakespeare Street will comprise harm to the significance of key highly graded listed buildings through loss to their historic streetscape setting and relative status, and through loss to the overall character of the Arboretum conservation area. Other solutions to Nottingham Trent University's requirements for Art and Design teaching space should be considered which avoid these harmful impacts; given time for further planning and partnership, reusing redundant historic structures and / or by the selection of less sensitive new build sites. We do not believe that this proposal for demolition will contribute to building a sustainable City or support the delivery of the Council's Heritage Strategy. Bringing tall buildings along Shakespeare Street will erode its character of place, the historic context of the Arkwright Building and the linkages to the high quality inter-war civic spaces created on South Sherwood Street around the Newton Building.

The new building addresses the brief given by NTU and is in its own terms an elegant structure, whilst the merits and benefits of the new build are set out in the material provided by the applicant, what concerns us is the matter of justification. Not only should it be demonstrated that this scheme is required but, given the loss inherent to its construction, it should also be shown if it is required exactly here and to be delivered immediately, hence the necessity of the demolition and harm that are proposed. We note the detailed site selection report supplied and its conclusion that within the constraints set out the Shakespeare Street site presents the only viable option. Opportunities might better be explored for the sustainable re-use of buildings with suitable spaces for the purposes required, for instance the former Fire and Police Building opposite. We understand the benefits of NTU consolidating functions and facilities for Art and Design but question whether an approach less pressured by immediate delivery and immediate availability might not allow a better long term outcome in terms of the City's historic environment through the identification of a re-use or new-build opportunity with a more positive impact upon the historic environment of the City further to NPPF paragraph 192.

We consider that the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 192,193,194 and 196.

[note: the paragraph numbers in Historic England's comments relate to a previous version of the NPPF]

Drainage: Shakespeare Street and the wider catchment has a longstanding flood history. The flood risk assessment has taken this into account and has modelled the risk to the development, proposing mitigation at each access point in addition to the minimum finished floor level. These mitigation measures must be implemented as part of the design. A site flood plan should be put together to ensure staff are aware of the flood risk and the required action to mitigate this at the points identified.

It is not clear yet how risk from the foul network will be addressed and advice should be sought from Severn Trent Water where necessary.

The SuDS system put forward for consideration is the use of a blue/green roof, and possibly cellular storage and permeable paving for the hardstanding/ground level areas. This needs to be developed further in the form of a Drainage Strategy. The development must utilise the SuDS proposed to reduce run-off from the site, and until this is evident in the overall plans for the development, I do not accept the proposals given the importance of SuDS in this area of risk.

Environmental Health: No objection subject to conditions. The development will have air source heat pumps & a range of other plant & equipment located both in a ground floor plant room & on the roof of the development. The closest residents appear to be in the flats above the PH at 38 Shakespeare Street & flats above shops further along Shakespeare Street; & residents on Matlock Court. However, because of the height of the development it may be that residents most affected by plant noise may be further away than the closest residents.

It is possible that internal building lighting / illumination may affect residents in Matlock Court. A condition requiring an external lighting assessment is recommended.

An air quality assessment is not required as the development has no provision for parking on site & no combustion process to provide energy for the operation of the development. No part of the development is given over to café / restaurant or similar uses so there is also no requirement for any odour extraction / ventilation system.

The Geotechnical and Geo-Environmental report has identified potential pollution linkages & an intrusive investigation is proposed, and a condition requiring a remediation strategy is recommended.

Biodiversity: Satisfied with the updated bat survey that has been provided. Recommend consideration of bat and swift boxes. Advise on review of scope of green roofs and planting opportunities.

City Archaeologist: No objection subject to condition requiring an archaeological evaluation in order to determine the character, condition and extent of archaeological remains on the site and form an evidence base to determine what further archaeological work may be required in advance of and/or during groundworks associated with the development. The submitted archaeological report considers the site to have potential for archaeological remains of post medieval date. There is some potential for caves at the site, associated with 19th century buildings. Any such caves are subject to the caves policy and requirements set out in the Management of Nottingham's Caves Supplementary Planning Document.

Design Review Panel: The Design Review process comprised of a pre-application session on 21 January 2021 and two post-application submission sessions, the first on 8 June 2021 and with a subsequent follow-up session on the 24 June 2021 to review further details provided by the design team. The following is a summary note of the final meeting.

Concern was raised in relation to the objection from Historic England, and the Panel repeated the issue previously raised between the building's brief in what the building needs to provide against why it needs to be this site. The Panel therefore strongly encouraged further dialogue with Historic England. The scheme needs to demonstrate an exemplar scheme through proposing a building of exceptional design quality that offers significant public benefit.

The concept of the building in terms of its use and opportunity for students to collaborate, and for it to promote and celebrate art and design is an exciting opportunity. The visuals show promise in terms of drawing people into the building from the street to encourage the collaboration and interaction that the building is trying to promote. As you move up the building, the sections begin to suggest how collaboration will be played out. This is an exciting vibrant focal building which has a seamless inside outside interaction which starts on the ground floor with its inviting sense and encouragement of interaction which then moves up throughout the building in a dynamic and exciting way. The Panel support the design team's 'beacon' analogy of the building. With also the engagement of students showcasing their work and the integration of technology within the building with multi-level projections, the Panel encourage a high impact visual approach to show how interesting, unique and distinctive the building could be for the city.

The size and scale of the building is commensurate with its status as an important, active and vibrant focal building for the city. The Panel therefore wholly support the ambition of the brief in the exciting uses and activities it will promote.

The ceramic cladding is a strong and very welcomed aspect of the scheme, in being a robust and timeless material choice, as well as the profile and texture allowing for opportunities of shadow modelling and artistic interpretation to make it interesting and subtle through textural and tonal changes to really articulate the building. However, the Panel have concerns regarding to the north elevation despite its more limited opportunities for articulation.

The Panel are convinced on the building's pathway to zero carbon. This building can be an exemplar on how sustainability can be achieved on what is a tall, complicated building. The potential that could come from the building in offering transferable zero carbon learning to other new buildings in the city should not be overlooked, together with the public benefit that will come from this.

Public realm benefits that the scheme can offer and realistically provide would be welcomed and beneficial to the scheme.

Overall, the Panel were positive and enthusiastic about the building, though fundamentally it is how this is squared with what is a constrained sensitive site with a strong historical context. A compelling and convincing narrative for the building, and how it will offer a strong positive contribution to public benefit is needed to justify its acceptance and offset the deep-seated concerns from Historic England.

6 Relevant policies and guidance

Aligned Core Strategies (ACS)

Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 1: Climate Change

Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity

Policy 11: The Historic Environment

Policy 17: Biodiversity

Land and Planning Policies (LAPP)

Policy CC1: Sustainable Design and Construction

Policy CC3: Water

Policy RE5: Royal Quarter

Policy DE1: Building Design and Use

Policy DE2: Context and Place Making

Policy EE4: Local Employment and Training Opportunities

Policy EN6: Biodiversity

Policy HE1: Proposals Affecting Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Policy HE2: Caves

Policy LS2: Supporting the Growth of Further and Higher Education Facilities

Policy IN2: Land Contamination, Instability and Pollution

NPPF (2021):

The NPPF advises that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that applications for sustainable development should be approved where possible. Paragraph 126 notes that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

In determining applications that may affect heritage assets, paragraph 194 of the NPPF advises that local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

Paragraph 197 of the NPPF then states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Paragraph 201 of the NPPF states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of) the significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

- Caves of Nottingham Supplementary Planning Document (2019)
- City Centre Urban Design Guide (2009)

7. Appraisal of proposed development

Main Issues

Whether:

- (i) the scale, mass, and design of the proposed development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the Arboretum Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings, including the Newton building, Arkwright building (including the boundary gates and walls of this building), University Hall, and 50 Shakespeare Street.
- (ii) the height, massing, layout, appearance and use of the proposed development is appropriate to the neighbouring properties and the wider area;

- 7.1 When considering whether or not to grant planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting, the LPA is under a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building, its setting and any special architectural or historic features, under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 (“the LBA 1990”). Furthermore, it is also necessary for a Local Planning Authority, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990, when determining a planning application within a conservation area.
- 7.2 In addition paragraph 199 of the NPPF indicates that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset (which includes both listed buildings and conservations areas), great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation...irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, should be exceptional; and in the case of grade II* listed buildings should be *wholly* exceptional.

Issue (i) Scale, mass and design and impact upon the character and appearance of the Arboretum Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings, including the, Arkwright Building (including the boundary gates and walls of this building), University Hall, the Newton Building, and 50 Shakespeare Street. (ACS Policies 10 and 11 and LAPP Policies DE1 and HE1)

Demolition - loss of heritage assets / impact on the character and appearance of the Arboretum Conservation Area/ impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings

- 7.3 The Heritage Statement submitted with the application concludes that the existing buildings make a ‘modest positive contribution’ to the character and appearance of the Arboretum Conservation Area. The buildings are of a scale that generally consistent with other buildings of a similar age on Shakespeare Street and their design and appearance is considered to reinforce this contribution, both in terms of the street scene of the Conservation Area and in relation the setting of the surrounding listed buildings including University Hall and the Arkwright Building.

Whilst the application submission cites their vacancy and poor general condition as negative aspects, it does not advocate that the buildings are beyond being capable of refurbishment and reuse. Rather that the applicant has established a need for a new digital art and design facility and that the current buildings have been assessed as being unviable in terms of their ability to meet this need. The proposed development is therefore presented as one that considers demolition in the context of the greater public benefits that may arise through the proposed redevelopment of the site and that these benefits should be weighed in terms of the decision making balance.

- 7.4 Historic England (HE) have currently assessed that the proposed demolition and redevelopment would comprise harm to the significance of key highly graded listed buildings through loss to their historic streetscape setting and relative status, and through loss to the overall character of the Arboretum conservation area. HE have therefore challenged the applicant to justify that other less sensitive sites are unavailable, and that the development is required immediately and on this particular site. This exercise has been carried out and has included the review of all buildings with the NTU campus, and with of 8 shortlisted sites having been assessed in detail.
- 7.5 The loss of the existing buildings and their replacement with a building of the scale and design being proposed will fundamentally alter the character and appearance of this part of the Arboretum Conservation Area. The modest scale and appearance of the existing buildings are in general harmony with the character and appearance of the area and they do not compete for visual attention when compared to the scale and quality of architecture of the significant surrounding heritage assets, including the Arkwright and Newton Buildings and University Hall. Whilst they are not designated heritage assets, and their current vacancy and general poor condition is noted, these are considered to be limited negative factors to buildings that otherwise make a positive contribution to the conservation area.
- 7.6 The response of Historic England (HE) notes that “the proposed demolition and replacement of the extant historic buildings on site will comprise less than substantial harm to the significance of the assets...through the loss of historic streetscape context and relative status in respect of the listed buildings and through loss to the character of the conservation area.” HE do not indicate, therefore, that the proposed development is fundamentally flawed, indeed the response of HE to the first submission advises that “the new building addresses the brief given by NTU and is in its own terms an elegant structure”.
- 7.7 The applicant’s requirement is for a usable space of 5,300sq.m and no existing campus buildings are considered to offer the potential to meet this need. Commencement on site in 2021 has also been advised to be essential in order to deliver the facilities when they are needed and not when it is too late. Whilst it is noted that there is potential in the redevelopment of a number of older buildings on campus, it is concluded that these have insurmountable timing and cost implications which render them unrealistic options at this time. The application site has been considered capable of being cleared and developed in a time-frame consistent with NTU’s ambitions. Further cost analysis of the potential development of the alternative site with the greatest potential of meeting the development timeframe (NTU’s Gill Street car park) has also now been provided, but has concluded that the additional costs to redevelop this site would be in excess of those for the application site in addition to this site lacking the prestige and prominence offered by the application site. On this basis it is considered that the

applicant has now fully justified the selection of the application site for the proposed development.

- 7.8 It is noted that the critical issue for Nottingham Civic Society is not the loss of the existing buildings but “the sheer scale of the proposed replacement, both its relative height and in its massive elevational components”. This comment and those of other respondents are now considered in relation to the assessment of the design of the proposed development as now recently revised.

Impact of development building on the character and appearance of the Arboretum Conservation Area/ impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings

Scale, Massing and Design

- 7.9 The site is located in the Northern and Western Fringe area identified in the City Centre Urban Design Guide, where it is envisaged that new development will generally be ground plus four residential storeys, up to an eaves height of 17m. However, the guide also notes that tall buildings up to four residential storeys higher than the predominant building heights may be acceptable, subject to detailed assessment. It is acknowledged that the commercial storey heights are greater than the ground plus eight residential storeys that the design guide suggests as a maximum, but It is considered that the applicants have undertaken sufficient analysis (including analysis of impact on the vista from Belle Vue Reservoir, as identified in the guide) to demonstrate that a building of the scale proposed, and of sufficient design quality, can be accommodated on this site as a positive contribution to the cityscape.
- 7.10 The revised submission, whilst being similar in scale and mass to that originally proposed, is significantly changed in terms of its design and appearance. The most evident visible change is a move from a white to a green glazed ceramic tile system, which has softened the visual impact of the proposed building but has also introduced a ceramic tile colour that has more connection with Nottingham through its use on local historic precedents. Whilst the exact nature of its use across the elevations is still being reviewed with the applicant, including variation in the embedded colour finish and profile of this material and integration of public artwork within the main entrance columns, it is considered that the quality and colour finish being proposed has been a very positive move in terms of the appearance of the building.
- 7.11 The design and massing of the proposed building has also been revised with greater architectural focus now being placed on the corner ‘tower’ element of the design. The high level picture window feature is now positioned on the corner rather than being offset and is provided with added prominence by being more slender and by projecting out from the façade of the building. The further use of large sections of glazing on the floors below this feature element reinforces this focus as well as providing a more appropriate emphasis to this significant corner of the building in both middle and longer distance views. Planning conditions are proposed to secure the quality of detailed elements of the proposed buildings’ design.
- 7.12 The main entrance of the proposed building is improved through the provision of a triple height entrance that is proportionate to the scale of the ‘tower’ but will also have a dramatic impact at street level. The use of integrated public artwork within

the entrance columns will also engage the pedestrian scale at street level. The contribution of the revised design at street level is continued across the ground floor on Shakespeare Street through the use of large display windows in the section of the proposed building that would be next to University Hall. The colour of the glazed ceramic tile system on this section of the façade would be in a darker green to visually frame this ground floor display and to introduce further variety to the façade at street level.

- 7.13 The scale of the upper floors of the revised design next to University Hall has been reduced. The upper floors are now set back from the boundary with this listed building, significantly reducing the overall scale impact, and the balance of ceramic tile system to glazing has also been improved to provide a more sympathetic transition in terms of the street scene relationship with this important neighbouring building. The additional benefit of a roof terrace with resultant public views to the south is also acknowledged and the applicant has also included a green wall system at the terrace level to provide natural visual interest and biodiversity.
- 7.14 The principal ceramic elements of the Shakespeare Street elevation of the proposed design are separated by the fully glazed façade to the central scissor stair core feature of the interior of the building, becoming a design element that will be visually prominent and active in evenings and nights throughout much of the year.
- 7.15 This more considered approach to the design and massing of the proposed building has been carried through to the east and west elevations, with the arrangement of glazing in particular having been improved to the benefit of the composition of these elevations. Whilst there is ongoing discussion in relation to the north elevation, including the constraints imposed through the boundary position with neighbouring buildings and functional need to locate lift cores and other back of house elements, it is considered that this elevation is also improved upon the original submission and that a design solution which acknowledges the prominence of this elevation is also capable of being resolved. An update on progress will therefore be provided to Committee.
- 7.16 The development will potentially impact upon the setting of a number of Listed Buildings and upon the character and appearance of a Conservation Area, notably:
- University Hall and attached railings (Grade II);
 - The Arkwright and Newton Buildings (both Grade II*);
Gates, railings and boundary walls to Arkwright building (Grade II);
 - Former Police and Fire Stations and Guildhall (Grade II);
 - Former Registry Office and attached area wall and railings at 50 Shakespeare Street (Grade II);
 - YMCA building (Grade II)
 - Arboretum Conservation Area
- 7.17 The Heritage Assessment submitted with the application assesses the impact of the development on these and concludes that “there would be some, less than substantial harm to the settings of the Grade II listed Shakespeare Street Synagogue, the Grade II listed Registry Office and the Grade II* Newton and Arkwright buildings.” The assessment notes “There is no doubt that the increase in height and mass will change a number of key views, and settings of some of the nearby listed buildings but overall these changes do not give rise to undue harm to their settings.”

- 7.18 Officers consider that the proposed development, due to its scale and architectural elements, will undoubtedly appear as a significant and assertive building that rises above the heights of surrounding buildings. The changes to the setting of the listed buildings identified in the heritage assessment, through the change in scale and reduced relative prominence of these buildings, is considered to be harmful to their historic significance.
- 7.19 Whether or not a proposal causes ‘substantial’ or ‘less than substantial’ harm is a matter for the decision maker. Relevant case law and guidance suggests that ‘substantial’ harm will arise where there is a substantial or near total loss of significance, and that this is a high test that is likely to be met in only a few cases. Overall, the applicant’s Heritage Assessment conclusion that the harm it identifies to the setting of the listed buildings identified above is ‘less than substantial’ is correct.
- 7.20 The concerns of the Civic Society are noted in relation to the applicant’s heritage assessment, and in particular their view in relation to University Hall that “[t]he adjacent listed building would be completely overwhelmed by the new structure”. There is clearly a substantial difference in scale between the proposed development and University Hall. Such differences in scale are not uncommon in an urban context, and it is considered that such a juxtaposition does not in itself diminish the historical value or the architectural interest of the building. The verified views provided by the applicant illustrate that University Hall sits back from the existing buildings on the application site, and so only reveals itself in closer views from the east, whilst from the west the side elevation of the existing buildings provides a plain backcloth to the classical architecture of the University Hall frontage that would be perpetuated by the architecture of the proposed development, albeit with a building of much greater scale.
- 7.21 Undoubtedly, the scale of the proposed development is massive within the context of its lower rise surroundings. In addition to the sensitivity of the key highly graded listed buildings it would, therefore be a development that could justify a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of the impact of its scale upon the amenity and character of the area, and the harm to designated heritage assets (albeit ‘less than substantial’) as detailed above. It is therefore appropriate to assess whether the harmful impacts of the development are outweighed by significant public benefits.
- 7.22 As noted above, the harm caused in each case is considered to be ‘less than substantial’, so the more stringent test of NPPF paragraph 201 applicable to ‘substantial harm’ is not invoked. Paragraph 202 states: “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”
- 7.23 There is therefore a balance for the decision maker to make, between the harm or loss of a heritage asset, and whether such harm or loss is necessary and justified in the interest of the wider public benefit of a proposed development. The design merits of a proposed development are not sufficient in themselves in order to reach such a decision.
- 7.24 Planning Guidance on the Historic Environment advises that ‘Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine

public benefits.' Such public benefits are therefore considered to include economic, social and environmental objectives.

Public Benefits

7.25 The applicant's report on the public benefits of the proposed development includes the following summarised statements:

- The proposals for the School of Art & Design will act as a valuable stimulus to the area. The proposals have the potential to act as the requisite catalyst for other schemes to progress.
- The synergy of the current proposals to both the partnership working agenda and the direct relevance to creative technologies as a key emerging sector are absolutely clear
- The development will bring, directly and specifically responds to the Council Plan and Economic Recovery Plan priorities and indirectly to the others. As such there is a real and direct public benefit from this investment and building in helping to deliver strategic economic, social and environmental priorities.
- The School of Art & Design proposals represent a committed circa £35 million investment directly into the heart of the City.
- An estimate potential of 144 additional general employees. Potential occupancy of 300-400 staff, with an additional 107 academic staff jobs in addition to those currently within the school.
- The creation of highly skilled technical jobs and direct opportunity for the new school to increase and improve skills in the key economic priority areas of creative technology, including collaboration with industry.
- 'Indirect' and additional employment including construction jobs.
- The provision of new public realm both directly related to the building and its surroundings.
- The provision of a space to celebrate art practice and champion it within Nottingham, regionally, nationally and internationally.
- A visually permeable building that will allow internal activity, across floors, to be seen from the outside. A building that will integrate with the space around it and will blur the interface between the interior and the exterior.
- A development that makes an absolute commitment to attain as close to zero carbon across its life span as possible. This is in the fabric, construction and operation of the building.

7.26 The applicant has provided justification on why this site would be the only site that would be available to accommodate their brief for a building with a usable space of 5,300sq.m within the necessary timescale and cost for delivery. The location of the application site is also noted as being significant to this decision in terms of its prestige and prominence for the level of investment being proposed.

7.27 It is the justification for the loss of the existing buildings and necessity for the proposed development that had been considered to require further explanation. It is considered that this has now been provided and that the public benefits of the proposed development do now outweigh the harm being caused through the loss of the existing buildings. Furthermore it is now considered that, subject to the pending updates and quality of final design details and external materials finishes, the design of the proposed development has achieved an exceptional quality that will be of benefit to the site, the NTU campus, and city as a whole.

Issue (i)- Overall Conclusion

- 7.28 Officers consider that the heritage impacts of this proposal are finely balanced. Harm to the historic environment will be caused as a result of:
- Demolition of the historic built fabric within the Arboretum Conservation Area;
 - A change in scale and character resulting from the new development within that conservation area;
 - Changes to the setting of Grade II and Grade II* listed buildings that are harmful because they diminish their relative prominence and historic significance.
- 7.29 Officers consider that the harm in each case is less than substantial, and that the scheme delivers the significant public benefits set out above. The applicants have sought to demonstrate that these public benefits can only be delivered on this site, within budget and within a timescale acceptable to the University, and their appraisal in this regard is accepted.
- 7.30 In addition, and whilst architectural quality is not in itself sufficient to outweigh harm, officers consider that the building is to a very high standard of design, and, whilst some design details remain to be finally resolved, there is confidence that the new building will be a very distinctive and locally significant piece of architecture that will benefit the city.
- 7.31 Historic England's comments regarding conflict with the council's heritage strategy are noted. This strategy seeks to understand the contribution that the historic environment makes to the city, capitalise on the existing and potential roles that heritage brings to city life, and celebrate the city's rich past, promoting Nottingham as distinctive place to live and visit. It is considered that the proposal does not conflict with this high-level strategy. In understanding the impact on the heritage assets that will be affected, the application gives an appropriate degree of understanding and recognition to the historic environment that is consistent with the aims of the strategy.
- 7.32 Account has been taken of the significance of each assets in turn and recognising that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be, it is considered that despite affording considerable importance and weight to the "desirability of preserving... the setting" of these heritage assets, there are significant and substantial public benefits of the proposed development (outlined above) which when placed in the planning balance outweigh the harmful impacts upon those heritage assets.
- 7.33 On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development follows the guidance within the NPPF, and in particular para 202, accords with ACS Policy 11 and LAPP Policy HE1 and complies with the duties within s66, and s72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990.

(ii) Scale, massing, layout, and use of the proposed development in relation to neighbouring properties and the wider area (ACS Policy 10 and LAPP Policies

DE1, LS2 and RE5)

- 7.34 The application site is included within the boundary of Nottingham Trent University's City Campus as defined within the LAPP. Policy LS2 states that planning permission will be granted for Higher Education, Research and Development and Information and Communication Technology facilities, and ancillary uses such as accommodation and catering facilities for staff and students. Policy RE5 also notes the strategic aim to providing new and improved education and conference facilities and uses associated with the University. It is therefore considered that the education use of the proposed development accords with Policies LS2 and RE5.
- 7.35 The proposed building will be visually and physically prominent in short and middle distance view within the area and, with the exception of the Newton Building, its height will be significantly taller than other buildings within its current immediate context. The objections of Matlock Court residents and Councillor Liversidge are acknowledged in this context.
- 7.36 Significant effort has been made to ensure that the design and appearance of the proposed development is both worthy of the site and area, being part of its local community of buildings as much as being a significant landmark development within the city as a whole. Therefore, whilst the height and mass of the proposed development will be very prominent in views from those proximate neighbours, this is considered to be mitigated in part by the quality of design and finishes that has been achieved. This is not to suggest that the height and mass of the proposed building will not be without impact upon those proximate neighbour as, by virtue of its significantly increased size it will alter the outlook of south facing residents as well as causing an element of overshadowing to the closer neighbours in the mid-afternoon hours at times in the year when the sun is lower to the horizon. However, it is considered that this level of impact is acceptable in the context of the merits and wider public benefits of the proposed development that are discussed above.
- 7.37 It is, however, noted that many of the comments of local residents to the proposed development extend beyond concerns on an individual basis and are also focussed on its design quality and impact on this area of the city centre in general. The responses of other city residents are also noted and welcomed in this respect. In welcoming those comments it is now considered that the revised submission has improved the design quality to one of exceptional standard. All further responses received will be updated to Committee.
- 7.38 The responses of the Mechanics Institute as the adjoining neighbour to the proposed development is also noted. Whilst the shadow impact on this adjoining neighbour is evident, as a non-residential building it is not considered that such a concern could warrant the further revision of the proposed development. The Mechanics Institute is recognised as a centre for cultural, educational and social activity and that development works does have the potential to disturb activities being carried out within the building. Whilst planning control over development is limited in this respect, efforts will be made in association with the applicant and the Environmental Health team to manage construction works in a manner that is respectful of this neighbour.
- 7.39 On balance and in recognition of the merits of the revised design of the proposed development and wider public benefits arising, it is considered that the impact of the scale, massing, layout, and use of the proposed development in relation to neighbouring properties and the wider area is acceptable in accordance with ACS

Policy 10 and LAPP Policy DE1.

Other

- 7.40 The response of the City Archaeologist is noted and reflected in the proposed conditions regarding an archaeological evaluation in order to determine the character, condition and extent of archaeological remains on the site, including the potential for archaeological remains of post medieval date and for caves. Subject to the proposed condition it is considered that the proposed development accords with LAPP Policies HE1 and HE2 and the Caves of Nottingham Supplementary Planning Document.
- 7.41 The response of Environmental Health is noted and reflected in the proposed conditions regarding a ground contamination remediation strategy; noise assessment and mitigation in relation to potential noise from plant and equipment; and an external lighting assessment of the impact of building lighting upon nearby residents in accordance with LAPP Policy IN2.
- 7.42 The response of the Drainage team is noted and reflected in the proposed condition requiring the implementation of proposed flood mitigation measures, and a requirement for a full drainage strategy and design details incorporating SuDS measures in accordance with LAPP Policy CC3.
- 7.43 The response of the Biodiversity team is noted and an update of the submitted protected species survey is currently being progressed by the applicant. The low potential for bats within the original survey is noted and is not therefore considered that this issue will impact upon the determination of the application. The provision of green wall planting at the roof terrace level as part of the revised design is welcomed, as well as the applicant's noted commitment to public realm improvements to North Sherwood Street and Shakespeare Street adjacent to the entrance of the proposed development. Subject to the receipt and review of the updated protected species survey it is considered that the proposed development accords with ACS Policy 17 and LAPP Policies DE2 and EN6.

8. Sustainability (ACS Policy 1 and LAPP Policy CC1)

- 8.1 The proposed development aspires to be a market leader and demonstrate an exemplar culture in sustainable construction. It targets BREEAM 'Excellent' rating and the applicant has also committed to delivering the building as Net Zero Whole Life Carbon. All of the carbon emissions related to the construction and use over the lifetime of the building are to be offset through sourcing energy from renewable sources. New public realm green spaces are also to be created for university staff and students, and the local community to enjoy whilst enhancing the biodiversity of the campus.
- 8.2 The proposed building is to use a fabric first approach. Passive technology is then used to reduce energy loads further. Low carbon technology is to be used to make use of the green electricity and the reduced emissions associated with them. Renewable sources of energy shall be subscribed to, to off-set total carbon emissions to zero. The modelling results show the predicted emissions associated with the building are to outperform the current Building Regulations minimum requirements by 12.9%.

8.3 Being implemented on this basis, it is considered that the proposed development would accord with Policy 1 of the ACS and Policy CC1 of the LAPP.

9 S106 (LAPP Policies IN4 and EE4)

9.1 The applicant has indicated that they will work with the Council's Employment and Skills team in relation to local construction job opportunities arising from the proposed development with a financial contribution of £68,436 in accordance with Policies IN4 and EE4 of the LAPP.

9.2 The proposed obligation accords with planning policy and is therefore reasonable, meeting the tests of Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

10 Financial Implications

A financial contribution of £68,436 in accordance Policy IN4.

11 Legal Implications

Under s 66 Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990, in determining an application which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The duty in s66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 must also be considered as a material consideration in the planning balance.

The Committee must afford considerable importance and weight to the "desirability of preserving... the setting" of listed buildings when weighing this factor in the balance with other "material considerations" which have not been given this special statutory status.

A finding of harm to the setting of listed buildings is a consideration to which the Committee must give "considerable importance and weight, when weighing up the harm, against any benefits or countervailing factors. However, that does not mean to say that a strong presumption against granting permission for development that would harm the listed building and or its setting, cannot be outweighed by substantial public benefits so as to rebut that presumption.

It is also necessary for a Local Planning Authority, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area, as designated heritage asset, under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990, when determining a planning application within a conservation area.

While the duty with regard to preserving or enhancing may only require that no harm should be caused, it nonetheless creates a "special presumption" and "considerable weight and attention" as a material planning consideration, should be given to any harm found to arise with regard to the character or appearance of the area.

The above duty means there is a strong statutory presumption against granting planning permission which does not so preserve or enhance. This must be placed

in the planning balance in determining the application. However, that presumption may be outweighed by other material considerations great enough.

Under s.72 it is the impact of the entire proposal which is in issue. In other words the decision maker must consider not merely the removal of the building or land in question, which made a positive contribution, but also the impact on the Conservation Area of the building/land which is intended to replace it.

The weight to be attached to each of the relevant historic dimensions or ingredients of the judgment is a matter which section 72 clearly leaves to the decision-maker in each individual case.

The remaining issues raised in this report are primarily ones of planning judgement. Should further legal considerations arise these will be addressed at the meeting.

12 Equality and Diversity Implications

The provision of Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant accessible buildings.

13 Risk Management Issues

None.

14 Strategic Priorities

Ensuring that all planning and development decisions take account of environmental and sustainability considerations. Ensuring Nottingham's workforce is skilled.

15 Crime and Disorder Act implications

Improved surveillance and community safety.

16 Value for money

None.

17 List of background papers other than published works or those disclosing confidential or exempt information

1. Application No: 21/00646/PFUL3 - link to online case file:

<http://publicaccess.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QQEU81LYJ9300>

18 Published documents referred to in compiling this report

Aligned Core Strategies – Local Plan Part 1 (2014)

Land and Planning Policies – Local Plan Part 2 (2020)

NPPF (2021)

National Planning Practice Guidance (2019)

Caves of Nottingham Supplementary Planning Document (2019)

Contact Officer:

Mr Jim Rae, Case Officer, Development Management.

Email: jim.rae@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. Telephone: 0115 8764074

