

PLANNING COMMITTEE

UPDATE SHEET

(List of additional information, amendments and changes to items since publication of the agenda)

20 October 2021

5(a) 40 and 42 Shakespeare Street

Further Responses

Councillor Liversidge: I still wish to object to this application. Despite its changes it will still overshadow the properties of my constituents living in Matlock Court.

Neighbour (Matlock Court): Having read through the observations of both the planning committee and planning officers and looked at the revised application it is pretty clear that previous comments by local residents about the inappropriate nature of a 9-storey building replacing a 3-storey structure have been ignored/dismissed. Instead, changes only to the appearance of the building seem to have been discussed.

Nevertheless, I wish to repeat my previous objections that the proposed new building will dominate the skyline, obstruct the sun for a large part of the afternoon and cast a shadow over Matlock Court.

Neighbour Matlock Court: I wish to reiterate my opposition to the proposed development of 40 and 42 Shakespeare Street.

I feel it is completely out of keeping with other buildings in this Conservation Area in both design and scale.

If it was passed I also feel that it would set an unfortunate precedent and allow all future buildings to be of the same or greater height.

As a very close neighbour living in low level housing I would like to maintain my standard of living and not have my house and garden completely overshadowed by a much higher building.

I question whether this would get planning permission if it was proposed in the suburbs and would like to have the same consideration.

City Resident: Original reservations of the proposal came from the scale of the building and the north elevation. The revised proposed north elevation is visually more interesting than the original but the new colour scheme seems ill-considered. The green seems to have been plucked from nowhere and not vernacular to the area. You have the white of Newton, the natural stone of Arkwright and the red brick from the nearby residential buildings. The dark green makes the building far more imposing and doesn't help with scale concerns, the revised floor plans also show that the building has been squared off. This has not added much floor space internally speaking but does again expand the external scale of the structure. It also closes off

that junction especially since the existing building and its neighbour has curved corners which open up the entrance to that street

City Resident: Believe there is no substantial change to the proposal, and my original comments stand. To reiterate, 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

City Resident: Disappointed at the lack of consideration to the surrounding buildings. The current facade ties in well with the street and is not at a stage of disrepair. The proposed replacement is at a minimum too large considering how close it fronts Shakespeare Street. While I am not opposed to statement structures, I'm not convinced the proposal sits well at the location.

Nottingham Civic Society: Continues to object strenuously to the substantial harm to significant nationally-recognised listed buildings - the University Hall (Grade II), 50 Shakespeare Street (Grade II), the Arkwright Building (Grade II) and the Newton Building (Grade II*). All the concerns raised by NCS in the original consultation still apply as the revised plans do not address any of the Civic Society's concerns about the scale, bulk or design.

The building is clearly too large for the site it is trying to occupy, as 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, resulting in its overwhelming impact on historic and other buildings in its considerable shadow.

NCS is disappointed that the scheme treats the historic environment with such a lack of respect, with the University's scheme damaging the settings of four of its own listed buildings whilst harming the appearance of the Arboretum Conservation Area.

NCS continues to urge a complete re-think of this proposal to safeguard Nottingham's distinctive historic environment.

Historic England: Advise that their substantive position remains unchanged.

Highways Observations: No objections subject to conditions/informatives.

The further responses received repeat the comments that have been made in relation to the original submission, particularly in relation to the scale and mass of the

proposed development and its impact upon its local context, including Matlock Court residents and proximate heritage assets. It is considered that the Appraisal of the Proposed Development section of the report (7) addresses those considerations.

(Additional Background Papers: Councillor Liversidge, 5.10.21; Neighbour (Matlock Court), 30.9.21; City Resident, 28.9.21; City Resident, 1.10.21; City Resident, 5.10.21; City Resident, 6.10.21; Nottingham Civic Society, 12.10.21 and Historic England, 19.10.21).

5(b) 273 Castle Boulevard

1. One additional representation has been received from a local resident. They wrote believing the Grove pub was being demolished to be turned into flats. They agree with the other objections of the risk of having more students; especially, because the height of the building (7 stories) in the middle of Victorian/Edwardian houses will be an eye-sore. They consider the existing building (at least keep the facade) should be retained and used as offices/ meeting space for one or both of the two primary schools nearby.

2. Taking account of the Vacant Building Credit it has been agreed that the development will be required to provide two affordable housing units. The applicant has agreed to their provision and as such the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy HO3 of the LAPP. The tenure of the units ie. affordable rent or social rent is still under discussion and the final details are recommended to be delegated to the Director for Planning and Regeneration as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the main report.

3. The applicant has confirmed that the development would provide a minimum betterment of 10% in carbon reduction above building regulations. In addition, the development will utilise air source heat pumps for hot water production.

1. For clarification the existing building is being retained and at most the proposed extension is largely three storeys in height to be in keeping with its residential context and the existing pub (not 7 stories as believed by the local resident). The issue of its occupation by students is covered in the main report.

2. An additional condition is recommended to ensure the delivery of the proposed renewable energy measures, proposed as part of the development and read as follows:

“Notwithstanding the submitted information and prior to the commencement of above ground development, details of the sustainability measures to be incorporated within the development to reduce carbon emissions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development incorporates sustainable design features to accord with Policy 1 of the ACS and Policy CC1 of the LAPP.”

5(d) 770 Wollaton road

Consultation response from Highways: No objection subject to conditions and informatives.

The majority of issues raised are already covered by condition, other than the following that is recommended for inclusion:

Prior to the commencement of a development, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include details of how provision shall be made to accommodate all site operatives, visitors and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning during the construction period.

The approved Plan shall be implemented at all times during the construction period.