

## **Report of Director of Planning and Regeneration**

### **34 Tennyson Street, Nottingham**

#### **1 Summary**

Application No: 19/00771/PFUL3 for planning permission

Application by: Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of Thorpe And Fletcher Developments Ltd

Proposal: Demolition of existing building and construction of ten 6-bed student accommodation dwellings.

The application is brought to Committee because it is major application that has generated significant public interest that is contrary to the officer recommendation.

To meet the Council's Performance Targets this application should have been determined by 7th October 2021

#### **2 Recommendations**

2.1 To **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** for the reasons set out in this report, subject to:

- (i) the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notices at the end of this report;
- (ii) prior completion of an agreement under Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 to secure a section 106 planning obligation, which shall include:

- (a) an off-site policy compliant Open Space contribution of £12,649.80
- (b) a student management plan and restrictions on keeping private vehicles

2.2 Power to determine the final details of both the terms of the Planning Obligation and the conditions of planning permission to be delegated to the Director for 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 junction of Tennyson Street and Ayr Street. It

is currently vacant, with its last use being as a City Council community centre and associated open play space.

- 3.2 The existing building on the site is a two storey red brick terrace style property with a pitched roof. It is located to the south-east corner of the site, fronting onto Tennyson Street but set back off the street with a short front garden with boundary railings. The building abuts a neighbouring property (36 Tennyson Street). The rest of the application site is an open play space area with play equipment, formerly used in association with the community centre. There are a number of established trees around the street boundary of the site, as well as larger trees adjacent to the walled boundary between the site and the neighbouring purpose built student accommodation development (PBSA), Rise Student Living.
- 3.3 There is a neighbouring housing development at Francis Street to the east of the application site across Tennyson Street. This is a development of two storey terraced houses that take their primary access and have their front doors onto Francis Street but, in terms of the western terrace of this development, also have their rear gardens and boundary fences onto Tennyson Street.
- 3.4 To the north of the application site across Ayr Street is the enclosed grounds of the Unity and Denewood Learning Centre.
- 3.5 The existing building on the application site is included within the boundary of the Gamble Street/Alfreton Road Conservation Area. The open play space area of the application site is outside and therefore adjacent to the boundary of the Conservation Area. The open play space area of the application site is designated in the LAPP as being part of the Open Space Network.

## **4 Details of the proposal**

- 4.1 The application proposes the demolition of existing building (34 Tennyson Street) and construction of ten 6-bed student accommodation dwellings.
- 4.2 The proposed redevelopment comprises two short terraces of identical three storey buildings. There would be a terrace of 4 fronting onto Tennyson Street and a terrace of 6 onto Ayr Street. The terraces would be built predominantly in red brick and with steep pitched roofs and with stacked triangular bay window features to their front elevations. There would be short front gardens to the street, with low walls, railings and boundary hedges. There would be short enclosed rear garden areas and a communal access and a landscaped strip along the boundary with the neighbouring PBSA development. Each student accommodation dwelling would have would have a shared kitchen/living space on the ground floor and then three bedrooms on both the first and second floors.

## **5 Consultations and observations of other officers**

### **Adjoining occupiers consulted:**

26-30 (consec.) Francis Street  
36 Tennyson Street  
Units 1-3 Raleigh Court

The application was originally received and publicity, including neighbour notifications, site and press notices, was carried out on 11 April 2019. However, the

application was then subsequently held in abeyance. The application has now been substantially revised and adjoining occupiers and other respondents were re-notified on 20 July 2021. Further site and press notices were also published. The following responses received relate to the revised submission and therefore supersede all previous comments received in relation to the first submission:

**Neighbour:** Objection. Live opposite on Francis Street and already have problems with unacceptable student behaviour and parking. South facing garden has already been affected and do not support more development of this type.

**Neighbour:** Objection. Will mean more loud music all night every night, more broken bottles and glass to dodge, more rubbish dumped around the roads, and more abuse just because I live here.

**Neighbour:** Objection. There already being too many student accommodation blocks within three streets which is already in excess of 1500 individuals with over half this number appearing within the last 2 years. This volume of students is having a detrimental effect on the quality of life of the non-student community. The neighbouring housing on Francis Street will be directly impacted. The development will add to the vehicle burden in an already congested area, and limitations on students bringing cars into the area appears to not be enforced by landlords or the City Council. There will be anti-social behaviour issues of noise and nuisance, impacting on sleep. Concerns over drunkenness and drug use in the area, including broken bottles and litter. Concerns over waste management of bins.

**Neighbour:** Objection. This community space needs to stay within the community. The student population in the Arboretum ward is too vast already, with thousands of student beds within a few streets of this site already.

**Neighbour:** Objection. We need less student accommodation in this area and more family homes to restore the balance. There is excessive amounts of antisocial behaviour and uncontrollable amounts of waste on the streets caused by HMOs and student accommodation.

**Neighbour:** Objection. The area is already over-populated with students with concomitant antisocial behaviour and the City's resources for tackling student's antisocial behaviour are too limited. This student accommodation if built will only serve to burden residents in the area with unwanted and unnecessary problems.

**Neighbour:** Objection. There is too much student housing in the area to ensure a 'balanced community'. The new proposal would take it over the 25% threshold and this is already having a serious impact on the local community. The site is designated as open space in the LAPP. The proposal argues that it is underused, but it has been fenced off for years, without the local community having access - so people haven't had the opportunity to use it. Inner city communities need more access to open space; and the city needs to increase spaces for wildlife. The building that is being proposed for demolition is in a conservation area and any new development should protect and enhance the character of this area. The trees in the site are protected by a temporary tree protection order and are valued. The real pressures this area is under is with the volume of student housing already in the neighbourhood. Strongly believe the site should be returned to community use and provide accessible green space, or if it is going to be built upon, the development should increase the social housing provision in the area.

**Neighbour:** Objection. About 1 in 4 people resident in Nottingham are transient students. This is not good for long term residents or the city's broader economy - the former suffering from student domination of neighbourhoods, noise, litter, anti-social behaviour, lack of housing opportunities and the latter, the economy, skewed to meet their needs not the needs of long term residents e.g. bars, burger houses, hot food takeaways, clothes shops, clubs, escape rooms etc. rather than housing and other services for residents. The loss of much needed community centre facilities for locals. The City Council promised that the site would not be lost to yet more student housing. The application fails to meet the policies for balanced neighbourhood and family housing.

**Neighbour:** Objection. The proposed roof pitches and brickwork are not consistency with the existing street scene and style of existing properties. The submitted plans do not address the detachment of 34 from 36 Tennyson Street which will impact on the street scene of the area. The new external wall for 36 Tennyson Street should be in matching brickwork not render. Consideration of the impact on the roof structure of 36 and associated drainage issues needs to be show. A security gate/fencing needs to be in place to prevent the unauthorised access by external parties to the new passage between 36 and the new property to prevent unlawfully activities. Building works should be restricted. The proposed density of student properties in the area seems high with well-known social consequences. No car or cycle parking provision will naturally cause a problem for existing residents within the neighbourhood.

**Neighbour:** Objection. There already being too many student accommodation blocks within 3 streets which is already in excess of 1500 individuals with over half this number appearing within the last 2 years. This volume of students is having a detrimental effect on the quality of life of the non-student community.

There has been an upsurge in student vehicles that appear to not be enforced by landlords or City Council. There are ASB issues, particularly night time noise and disturbance and associated rubbish and poor waste management.

**Neighbour:** Objection. This community space needs to stay within the community. The student population in the Arboretum ward is too vast already and the local community is already suffering. The Tennyson Street Play Centre should be handed back to the community.

**Neighbour:** Objection. We need less student accommodation in this area and more family homes to restore the balance. There is excessive amounts of antisocial behaviour and uncontrollable amounts of waste on the streets caused by HMOs and student accommodation.

**Neighbour:** Objection. This application to put so many students in a residential street and neighbourhood flies in the face of the Council's Local Plan which has a very longstanding acknowledgment that several City neighbourhoods including the one affected by this application have an over population of students with concomitant antisocial behaviour. To approve this application invites antisocial behaviour into this street and neighbourhood. The City's resources for tackling student's antisocial behaviour are too limited. This student accommodation if built will only serve to burden residents in the area with unwanted and unnecessary problems.

**Neighbour:** Objection. Whilst I can see that changes have been made from the previous proposal, the same fundamental problems are still present. There is too much student housing in the area to ensure a 'balanced community'. The new proposal would take it over the 25% threshold and this is already having a serious impact on the local community. The site is designated as open space in the LAPP. The proposal argues that it is underused, but it has been fenced off for years, without the local community having access. Inner city communities need more access to open space and the city needs to increase spaces for wildlife. The building that is being proposed for demolition is in a conservation area and any new development should protect and enhance the character of this area. The trees in the site are protected by a temporary tree protection order and are valued. The site should be returned to community use and provide accessible green space. If it is going to be built upon, the development should increase the social housing provision in the area.

**Nottingham Civic Society:** Has reservations about some elements of the detailed design of the redevelopment scheme but recognises that the scheme is a great improvement on that originally submitted and has the potential to preserve the character and appearance of the Gamble Street Conservation Area if some minor adjustments are made to the design.

NCS considers that the use of grey brick for the rear elevations is a mistake, when viewed from the patios, the buildings will look dreary and disheartening. Red brick should be used instead. The use of "off white" render within the front window openings is also problematic as it will probably discolour very quickly and make the whole frontage look uncared for and damaging the appearance of the conservation area.

The siting of front doors below the overhanging first floor could result in a poorly lit space which could represent something of a security issue. Furthermore, the lack of depth in the masonry is disappointing, relying only on flat soldier courses, with the exception of the panels of projecting brick patterns on gable ends. The eaves and gable edges at least should offer some relief and depth in the brickwork.

#### **Additional consultation letters sent to:**

**Environmental Health:** No objection subject to condition requiring ground and groundwater contamination assessment.

**Parks & Open Spaces Development Manager:** No objection. Satisfied that the submitted Design & Access Statement justifies the loss of Open Space Network and satisfies the policy requirements provided that an off-site contribution is secured for improvements to open spaces in the area.

**Biodiversity:** No objection subject to conditions requiring bat and bird boxes, and a planting plan with the use of native trees or fruit bearing trees which have a higher ecological value.

**Drainage:** No objection subject to condition requiring surface water run-off to be limited to greenfield rates. The development is situated within the Leen/Daybrook catchment. Surface water run-off rate should be achieved taking into account the building hierarchy for the disposal of surface water and must be supported by the relevant calculations and drainage strategy.

**Education:** No S106 claim for student accommodation.

## **6 Relevant policies and guidance**

### **Aligned Core Strategies**

Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 1: Climate Change

Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity

Policy 17: Biodiversity

### **Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document - Local Plan Part 2**

Policy CC1: Sustainable Design and Construction

Policy CC3: Water

Policy DE1: Building Design and Use

Policy EN1: Development of Open Space

Policy EN2: Open Space in New Development

Policy EN6: Biodiversity

Policy EN7: Trees

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

Policy HO6: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and Purpose Built Student Accommodation

Policy IN2: Land Contamination, Instability and Pollution

Policy IN4: Developer Contributions

### **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 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.

## **7. Appraisal of proposed development**

### **Main Issues**

- (i) Student accommodation use and impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the wider area.
- (ii) Scale, layout and design and impact upon the character and appearance of the Gamble Street/Alfreton Road Conservation Area.
- (iii) Loss of Open Space Network and existing site trees (ACS Policy 17 and LAPP Policies EN1, EN2, EN6 and EN7)

### **Issue (i) Student accommodation use and impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the wider area. (LAPP Policy HO6).**

- 7.1 It is recognised that a number of larger scale PBSA developments have been developed in this area of the city in recent years within the area of the application amounting to a 'significant concentration'. Those developments have occurred on sites that have either been vacant or underused and where the prospect of other development coming forward has been limited. The subsequent scale of development has generally reflected the scale of the surrounding former factory buildings that are a characteristic of the area and which have also been previously converted to various types of residential accommodation.
- 7.2 Policy HO6 of the LAPP recognises that a 'significant concentration' of student households within an area can, in itself, amount to grounds for the refusal of a

planning application and that an exception to the approach of refusing consent must be fully justified.

- 7.3 The neighbouring development to the south of the application site is a recent six storey PBSA on Russell Street. The neighbouring development to the north is a group of small business workshop units. Opposite to the north on Ayr Street is the Unity and Denewood Learning Centre and its grounds, whilst opposite to the east on Tennyson Street is the rear gardens and residential properties on Francis Street. Although the surrounding use characteristics of the site are therefore mixed, it is considered that the scale relationship and boundary proximity of the neighbouring PBSA on Russell Street exerts a significant physical influence upon any future development of the application site. By contrast the smaller scale and proximity of the rear gardens and properties on Francis Street are sensitive to change in terms of both the use and proposed scale of development of the application site.
- 7.4 The application site is occupied by a single vacant terrace style building and is otherwise currently undeveloped. Its history, however, is one which has been previously developed by terrace properties with frontages to Tennyson Street and Ayr Street, and substantially along the lines of the footprint being proposed in the current planning application. The principle of its redevelopment to the layout and scale that is being proposed is therefore considered to be appropriate. It is a layout that understands the historic pattern of development of the site and, at three storeys plus roof, it is a scale that is common to properties further along Tennyson Street and would mediate between the scale of the six storey PBSA on Russell Street and the two storey properties on Francis Street.
- 7.5 The proposed student accommodation is for ten individual properties each having six student bedrooms. The format of the proposed development is therefore also one that mediates between that of the large scale PBSA on Russell Street and family housing within the area. The internal standard of proposed accommodation is also considered to be good, with shared use of the ground floor kitchen/living space being communal to each individual property. Cycle and bin storage is also accommodated and accessible to the rear of each individual property. It is therefore considered that the layout and amenity of the proposed development would be appropriate to the number of occupants. It is also noted that the individual nature and layout of the properties would readily lend themselves to future conversion to other residential accommodation should there be any future lack of student demand.
- 7.6 Whilst due regard must be paid to the amenity of the neighbouring residential development on Francis Street, it is considered that the individual characteristics of the application site and relationship to neighbouring PBSA developments, and adjoining and opposite commercial and primary school uses, do warrant consideration in terms of the viable future development of the application site. The format and layout of the proposed development is considered to be an appropriate mediation between these developments, providing a good standard of accommodation in a scale of building that would not impose or dominate the relationship with residential properties on Francis Street.
- 7.7 The issues of antisocial behaviour in the area are noted and understood. Student management agreements exist for the existing PBSA developments in the area and it is appropriate that the managers of these developments respond to the concerns of local residents where it is reported that residents of their developments are causing nuisance to local residents. Student management agreements have been

attached to all purpose built student accommodation developments for many years now and are considered to be effective, including an obligation to publicise a 24 hour contact number should local residents encounter any disturbances they wish to report, for local resident. A further common obligation to student management agreements is a requirement that rooms are not let except on the condition that student occupants do not keep a motor vehicle within the boundaries of the City. It is generally understood that this has been an effective deterrent to student car use within the city and there have been no instances of complaints received on this basis. A student management agreement is proposed as a necessary requirement of planning permission in this instance.

- 7.8 The proposal is for the development of a vacant site that is considered would be unlikely to be developed for other viable uses and on balance it is considered that the proposed student accommodation use at the scale proposed would be appropriate to the site and area in accordance with LAPP Policy HO6.

**Issue (ii) Scale, layout and design and impact upon the character and appearance of the Gamble Street/Alfreton Road Conservation Area (ACS Policies 10 and 11 and LAPP Policies DE1 and HE1).**

- 7.9 The existing terrace building is captured within the boundary of the Gamble Street/Alfreton Road Conservation Area and is part of a small cluster of Victorian age properties at the junction of Tennyson Street with Russell Street. Whilst being part of this small cluster, it is an individual building and remnant of a terrace that continued to the junction with Ayr Street. Whilst having some interesting brick details, it is generally unremarkable in its appearance. Being set back off the edge of the street, it is not prominent in the street scene of the area and is also screened from view within the Conservation Area by the side elevation of the neighbouring property. The building has been previously altered and is in a generally poor external condition. In the context of the high standard of design of the proposed development discussed below, it is considered that the loss of this building would amount to less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and that the public benefits arising from the enhancement of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a consequence of the proposed development would outweigh its loss in accordance with paragraph 202 of the NPPF and LAPP Policy HE1.
- 7.10 Whilst the proposal for ten 6-bed student accommodation dwellings remains as originally proposed, the revised submission is a comprehensive rethinking of the design and appearance of the proposed development. The proposed terraces address Tennyson Street and Ayr Street, with front doors to the street and with a short but appropriate front gardens with low boundary walls and railings and hedges being used to define the street edge. There is a quality and distinct character to the front elevations of the terraces, with the repetition of their gabled façade providing a rhythm and identity to the development. The inclusion of stacked angular bay windows and subtle but effective brickwork detailing is also considered to provide a contemporary appearance to an otherwise conventional terrace development. It is considered that the design quality of the proposed development would be positive to the character and appearance of the Gamble Street/Alfreton Road Conservation Area as well as the appearance of the area in general. Subject to conditions to ensure the quality of details throughout implementation of the proposed development, including the approval of samples of external materials, it is therefore considered that the proposed development would accord with ACS Policies 10 and 11 and LAPP Policies DE1 and HE1.

**Issue (iii) Loss of Open Space Network and existing site trees (ACS Policy 17 and LAPP Policies EN1, EN2, EN6 and EN7)**

- 7.11 The open space play area of the application site is defined in the LAPP as being part of the Open Space Network. An assessment of the value of the site to the OSN has been provided and has been reviewed by both the Parks & Open Spaces Development Manager and the Biodiversity Officer. It is advised that the land is considered surplus to open space requirements in accordance with LAPP Policy EN1, subject to the off-site contribution to be for improvements to open spaces in the area that is to be secured in accordance with LAPP Policy EN2.
- 7.12 Having been previously used as an open space play area, the application site is populated by a number of trees, many that have been planted around the perimeter of the site on Tennyson Street and Ayr Street, but also three larger specimen trees within the site that are proximate to the boundary wall between the site and the neighbouring purpose built student accommodation development of Rise Student Living. A temporary Tree Preservation Order was put in place for the three larger specimen trees in order that their condition was able to be properly assessed as part of the proposed development and an Arboricultural Survey has subsequently been provided. Whilst the survey records that they are sycamore trees that have public amenity value due to their size and visibility, it also notes that there is evidence of structural damage being caused to the boundary wall due to the proximity of these trees. In concluding that it would not be possible to develop the site to the extent being proposed without the removal of the trees, the survey also advises that the trees will need to be removed to safeguard the structural integrity of the boundary retaining wall.
- 7.13 Whilst the proposed development has made some provision for replacement tree planting, it is not possible to accommodate the same extent of tree coverage across the site as exists at present. In the light of the submitted Arboricultural Survey and the tree planting that is able to be accommodated within the site layout, the proposed development is therefore considered to accord with Policy EN7. It would be possible for the S106 contribution towards open space improvements to be allocated to off-site tree planting.

**8. Sustainability / Biodiversity (LAPP Policies CC1, CC3 and EN6)**

- 8.1 The applicant has advised that each of the dwellings will be highly insulated, significantly reducing heat loss and ensuring that energy consumption associated with the heating of the dwellings will be minimised. Weather compensator monitors are to be installed for every boiler in the development, ensuring that each boiler operates at maximum efficiency. Sustainable drainage systems are also to be provided. It is therefore considered that the proposed development accords with LAPP Policy CC1 and CC3.
- 8.2 The Biodiversity team have advised that the updated Ecological Report provided is satisfactory. The incorporation of bird boxes, plus full planting details and use of native species is a proposed condition in accordance with LAPP Policy EN6.

## **9 Section 106 (LAPP Policies HO6, IN4, and EN2)**

- 9.1 In accordance with the Open Space Supplementary Planning Guidance in place on the date that this application was submitted an off-site Open Space contribution of £12,649.80 towards open space improvements is to be provided in accordance with Policies EN2 and IN4.
- 9.2 A student management plan will be a requirement of the S106 agreement and includes a commitment for an operator to work proactively with the local community, including 24 hour contact details and community liaison. Restrictions on student occupants keeping private vehicles within the city will also be applied. It is considered that appropriate student management measures will therefore minimise any impact of the student accommodation use on the local community in accordance with Policy HO6 of the LAPP.
- 9.3 The proposed obligations accord with planning policy and are therefore reasonable, meeting the tests of Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

## **10 Financial Implications**

Financial contributions of £12,649.80 in accordance with LAPP Policies IN4, EN2, and the Open Space Supplementary Planning Guidance in place on the date that this application was submitted, would be secured

## **11 Legal Implications**

It is 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.

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 which made a positive contribution, but also the impact on the Conservation Area of the building which is intended to replace it.

In this instance there is a finding of less than substantial harm. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

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 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.

**15 Crime and Disorder Act implications**

Improved surveillance and community safety.

**15 Value for money**

None.

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

1. Application No: 19/00771/PFUL3 - link to online case file:

<http://publicaccess.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=PPOJE1LYMWD00>

**17 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)

**Contact Officer:**

Mr Jim Rae, Case Officer, Development Management.

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

