

Nottingham City Council

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at Ground Floor Committee Room - Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG on 20 July 2022 from 2.31 pm - 3.44 pm

Membership

Present

Councillor Michael Edwards (Chair)
Councillor Graham Chapman (Vice Chair)
Councillor Leslie Ayoola
Councillor Azad Choudhry
Councillor Kevin Clarke
Councillor Jay Hayes
Councillor Angela Kandola
Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan
Councillor AJ Matsiko
Councillor Ethan Radford
Councillor Cate Woodward

Absent

Councillor Corall Jenkins
Councillor Sally Longford
Councillor Salma Mumtaz
Councillor Toby Neal
Councillor Mohammed Saghir

Colleagues, partners and others in attendance:

Paul Seddon - Director of Planning and Regeneration
Martin Poole - Area Planning Manager
Ann Barrett - Team Leader, Legal Services
Karen Shaw - Local Plans Manager
Catherine Ziane-Pryor - Governance Officer

17 Apologies for Absence

Councillor Corral Jenkins – personal
Councillor Sally Longford – leave
Councillor Salma Mumtaz - other council business
Councillor Toby Neal - other council business

18 Declarations of Interests

None.

19 Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed the true record and signed by the Chair.

20 28 - 32 Hall Street Nottingham NG5 4AS

Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, presented application 21/02693/PFUL3 by Hockley Developments Ltd on behalf of Hockley Developments Ltd, for planning permission for the partial demolition and extension and conversion to form 13 supported living dwellings with

staff/communal spaces. External area to provide 2 parking spaces, amenity space, and secure bin and cycle stores.

The application had been submitted to the last committee meeting and the decision deferred pending the outcome of officer discussions with the developers on several points.

The application, presents several amendments from the last submission and further clarity on the application. CGIs are also provided along with further detailed drawings within the presentation including street and aerial views of the current site, floor plans of every floor of the development, including the reconfigured and enlarged communal outdoor area.

Further points highlighted and responses to members' questions included:

- a) the Street elevations have been revised and now include further attention to detail around the windows, raised brick courses, and revised treatment of the entrances;
- b) render remains a feature of the design to acknowledge the context of the building within the local area where the majority of neighbouring properties are rendered. The use of render also enables faster construction, which is important for minimising disruption to neighbouring residents;
- c) some elements of the existing structure will be retained which promotes sustainability;
- d) following committee members' comments, the roof now also includes solar panels and the developer has made a commitment to achieving a BREEAM rating of 'very good';
- e) sectional drawings of the previous and current proposals illustrate the changes made including reducing part of the extension to enable the outdoor space to be reconfigured, paved and to provide a variety seating options, some with shade;
- f) the development occupies the same foot print as the current building and provides an acceptable quality of space for the individual units which are not unusually small and all of which meet the national space standard. The proposal includes a communal indoor space/common room;
- g) the scheme has been created to meet the specific needs of the users, and as previously stated, residents are able to live independently, but will require some level of support and are unlikely to possess cars. However, it is not feasible to include limits on car usage within any conditions. There is a high level of on street parking within the area and a nearby public car park. There is no guarantee there won't be an impact on parking, but it isn't likely to be much different to the level of parking generated by the current lawful use of the building;
- h) the quality and durability of the boundary treatment can be addressed within conditions;
- i) officers believe the natural light from the second floor rooms is adequate and appropriate;
- j) Building regulations deal with issues such as energy insulation and heat management, particularly with reference to the extreme heat of the last few days. Recent changes in

building regulations will significantly address overheating of buildings, particularly where they are well insulated. These are technical points beyond the remit of planning permission. A definitive answer could not be provided at meeting as to whether this scheme complied with the most recent building regulations, or those issued earlier.

Members of the committee commented as follows:

- k) the cosmetic exterior design improvements are welcomed;
- l) it is not believed that the development will result in local parking issues as there appears to be a fairly remote possibility of residents owning cars, and the attendance of staff vehicles is unlikely to exceed activity generated by the current site user;
- m) the amendments to the communal outdoor space and parking area are, welcomed;
- n) the boundary treatment of wooden fencing is unattractive and not durable so a more sustainable and low maintenance and attractive alternative should be sought;
- o) if rendering has to be used then it should be of an appropriate quality to prevent unsightly staining;
- p) it's vital that the skylights of the second floor rooms are large enough to ensure there is adequate natural light to prevent the rooms feeling oppressive.

The Chair summarised the remaining issues of concern as follows and requested that officers sought to address them:

- o that the accommodation (particularly on the second floor) was appropriate with regard to any potential overheating issues;
- o that the amount of natural lighting to the second floor rooms is reviewed, particularly to the size of the skylights, to ensure it is day light is appropriate and prevents the rooms feeling oppressive;
- o for the boundary treatment to the shared open space to be revised in favour of a more durable and attractive material.

Resolved:

- 1) to grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the report, subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notices at the end of the report;**
- 2) for the power to determine the final details of the conditions of planning permission to be delegated to the Director of Planning and Regeneration.**

Councillor Kevin Clark requested that his abstention from voting is recorded.

Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, presented application 22/00070/PFUL3 by Mr Oliver Cammell on behalf of Mr Alan Forsyth, for planning permission for two apartment blocks to create 17 x one bedroom supported living units (including 1 for staff) and ancillary staff facilities.

Further information was provided within the update sheet, which also recommended an additional condition.

A presentation was delivered to accompany the application, which provided aerial and street views, including from the green space footpath, of the current area of land, and CGI's of how the proposal will look from different angles, including in the context of the surrounding buildings.

Following points were highlighted and members' questions responded to:

- a) the site formerly accommodated garages which were demolished several years ago;
- b) there is a change in level from the properties in front and behind the site;
- c) the City Council is commissioning the scheme for citizens who have been assessed to live in the community but with support. Four car parking spaces for staff have been included in the proposal but it is not anticipated that residents will be car owners;
- d) CGIs of the shared open space show the boundary treatment as railings, which replaces the previously proposed solid wood fencing. The final detail of the railings is yet to be confirmed, but it is noted that the metal fencing is in response to concerns around potential external antisocial behaviour and ensuring residents' safety;
- e) the loss of 2 on-street parking spaces is difficult to address, but whilst resident parking schemes allow roadside parking, they do not guarantee a parking space;
- f) there is a pending application for a proposed Lidl store and housing at the top of Belconnen Road. Traffic management of both developments (if granted) will be subject to conditions requiring a construction traffic management plan (condition 3 on this application), but guarantees that the construction periods will not co-incide cannot be provided;
- g) antisocial behaviour is an existing concern in this area, but officers do not feel that the scheme will exacerbate the issue and if anything, will improve the situation;
- h) solar panels have not been included as part of the application, and whilst officers can discuss this with the developer, it should be noted that there is already a viability challenge regarding the planning obligation; (NB. The draft planning permission attached to the report does in fact contain a condition requiring the submission of details to be approved relating to solar panels (Condition 5))
- i) some members of the committee may prefer an alternative to render, but it fits well in the context of the surrounding buildings;
- j) the details of the eaves and window reveals can be considered within condition 4.

Members of the committee commented as follows:

- k) the use of railings around the shared outdoor space, which will allow light in and extended views outwards, is welcomed and is far less oppressive and more sustainable than the previously proposed solid wood fencing;
- l) the overall treatment of the outdoor space is pleasing and welcomed;
- m) the new development should not have a negative impact on the existing alleyway along the end of the neighbouring block of flats by creating an unfriendly trench. There are also existing reports of drugs and antisocial behaviour in the area of the alleyway, of which the police are aware;
- n) it's frustrating that the development will result in the loss of two on road parking permit spaces, with no other option for resident parking;
- o) care should be taken with the timing of this development and the proposed development at the top end of Belconnen Road (proposing a Lidl store and housing) to ensure the volume of construction traffic is not overwhelming for such a small area;
- p) the provision of CGI's is helpful for providing scale and bringing the proposal to life;
- q) the telecoms cabinet seen on the street view photographs is not included in the CGI's so members are keen for confirmation that this has been taken into consideration with regard to access to the development;
- r) the development is likely to reduce antisocial behaviour and not have a negative impact on the alleyway, particularly if the outdoor lighting extends to the alleyway;
- s) the extreme heat of the last few days is a reminder that properties must not be too hot and that all extremes in temperature can be managed;
- t) whilst the landscape design is attractive, it is inevitable that people using the alleyway will create a natural/desire path and cut across the grass on the front of the scheme, so this needs to be taken into account, either with a boundary barrier, reconsidering the use of grass, or acknowledging the desire path and providing a suitable surface;

Resolved

- 1) **to grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the report, subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice at the end of the report and included in the update sheet as follows:**

'Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of all boundary enclosures, both within and around the perimeter of the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved details shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development';

- 2) **for the power to determine the final details of the conditions of planning permission to be delegated to the Director of Planning and Regeneration.**

22 Draft Statement of Community Involvement

Karen Shaw, Local Plans Manager, presented the Draft Statement of Community Involvement which replaces the 2019 version and now takes into account the additional processes for consultation should restrictions such as those resulting from the pandemic, be required again in the future.

The Portfolio Holder has approved the draft for consultation. Members of the Committee are invited feed into the six week consultation which starts in early August.

Comments and responses to questions included:

- a) it is an ongoing challenge to reach some sections of the community, but the council is looking towards increasing electronic engagement, but this doesn't suit everyone, so other methods are still used;
- b) this is a statutory document, but officers are taking a more creative approach, including adopting policies which provides guidance and additional engagement for citizens and developers;
- c) if 'street votes' is introduced then residents may be able to prevent development in their own street, this document, along with other policy, would have to be reviewed;
- d) many citizens have a lack of understanding of the council and planning committee powers, particularly believing that there is total control of what happens and where. However, the powers of the City Council and planning committee members are tied on some issues, specifically student accommodation. It's important for citizen to understand the parameters within which the local authority operates.

Resolved to note the Draft Statement of Community Involvement.