

# Nottingham City Council

## Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at Loxley House, Nottingham on 22 February 2023  
from 2.30 pm - 3.55 pm

### Membership

#### Present

Councillor Michael Edwards (Chair)  
Councillor Graham Chapman (Vice Chair)  
Councillor Angela Kandola  
Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan  
Councillor Sally Longford  
Councillor Ethan Radford (for items 57-60)  
Councillor Mohammed Saghir

#### Absent

Councillor Leslie Ayoola  
Councillor Azad Choudhry  
Councillor Kevin Clarke  
Councillor Jay Hayes  
Councillor Corall Jenkins  
Councillor AJ Matsiko  
Councillor Salma Mumtaz  
Councillor Toby Neal  
Councillor Cate Woodward

### Colleagues, partners and others in attendance:

Ann Barrett	- Legal Team Leader, Planning and Environment
Matt Gregory	- Head of Planning Strategy and Geographic Information
Rob Percival	- Area Planning Manager
Paul Seddon	- Director of Planning and Regeneration
Nigel Turpin	- Principle Design and Conservation Officer
Phil Wye	- Governance Officer

### 57 Apologies for Absence

Councillor Leslie Ayoola - leave  
Councillor Kevin Clarke – work commitments  
Councillor AJ Matsiko – other Council business  
Councillor Salma Mumtaz - leave  
Councillor Toby Neal – unwell  
Councillor Cate Woodward - unwell

### 58 Declarations of Interests

Councillor Michael Edwards declared that his previous public remarks regarding Sovereign House could cast reasonable doubt on his ability to make an unbiased decision. In addition Cllr Edwards wished to address the Committee as Ward Councillor on this item which would then require him to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on this item.

### 59 Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 21 December 2021 and on 18 January 2023 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair.

**60 Site Of Multi Storey Car Park Sovereign House And Factories Queens Bridge Road Nottingham**

Prior to the Committee's consideration of this item, Councillor Michael Edwards addressed the Committee in his role as a Ward Councillor and made the following points:

- (a) he had addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor and spoken out against the hybrid application when it was presented to Committee and had criticised the development (especially Phase 1) due to its poor appearance and poor environmental credentials. The Phase 1 building is utilitarian, will not meet current energy targets and is likely to be redundant in 25 years time. He had particularly been critical of its energy consumption, particularly during the summer months, since it has been constructed and occupied;
- (b) whilst he is mindful that this application is for reserved matters only, he would urge the Committee to look at the building's attractiveness and its energy efficiency claims in light of the city striving to become carbon neutral.

Councillor Michael Edwards left the meeting prior to discussion and voting on this item. Councillor Graham Chapman chaired the Committee for the remainder of this item.

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, presented application 22/00083/PRES4 by Carney Sweeney on behalf of Peveril Securities Limited, for approval of reserved matters in relations to details of appearance and landscaping for Phase 2 office development (Use-Class B1) approved under the hybrid planning application reference 18/02277/POUT.

Rob Percival delivered a presentation which included indicative images of the proposal.

The following points were highlighted:

- (a) Unity Square occupies a triangular site which is located to the south of the City Centre. It has frontages to Queen's Bridge Road/Sheriffs Way, Burnham Way, and also adjoins the main railway line from which it is separated by the Tinker's Leen watercourse;
- (b) Hybrid planning application (18/0277/POUT) was granted in January 2019 for a full planning permission for Phase 1 and outline planning permission for Phase 2. Details approved as part of the outline permission included layout, scale and access. Details of appearance and landscaping were reserved for future approval and this application seeks approval for those outstanding 'reserved matters'. Sustainability was not a matter under consideration within those reserved matters though some details were contained within the report by way of an update.
- (c) Phase 1 of Unity Square is now complete and occupied by HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC). Phase 2 is to be a 12 storey office development. The lower ground floor is to accommodate parking for 30 cars, 100 cycles, bin storage and

plant. The remaining part of the ground floor and upper floors would provide open plan office floorspace;

- (d) the originally submitted scheme proposed a more triangular shaped building with flat elevations, largely finished in a terracotta coloured, powder coated aluminium cladding. However, the form and architectural treatment of Phase 2 has subsequently been re-designed to more closely reflect the indicative proposals submitted as part of the 2018 hybrid application;
- (e) landscaping is proposed along the northern and western boundaries of the site. Seating and planters are proposed on the elevated area of public realm around the entrance to the building.

Members of the Committee commented as follows:

- (f) it is pleasing to note that sustainability considerations have improved since phase 1. It is unclear what is proposed for the roof, but photovoltaic panels or a green roof would be preferred, and this can be looked at separately when discharging conditions. The number of cycle spaces could potentially be increased and it was hoped that the narrower profile of the phase 2 building will aid with lighting;
- (g) the quality of the materials used for the cladding is an important consideration. This will likely now be the same quality as that used for phase 1 albeit a subtly different colour;
- (h) the opportunities for landscaping on this site are limited but trees along Tinkers Leen could be considered.

#### **Resolved to**

- (1) grant reserved matters approval subject to:**
  - (a) no adverse, material comments being received by the 28th February 2023 which arise from further publicity and consist of issues other than those already addressed by this report;**
  - (b) the indicative conditions substantially in the form of those listed in the draft decision notice at the end of this report.**
- (2) delegate power to determine the final details of the conditions to the Director for Planning and Transport.**

#### **61 191-195 (16A And 16B) Lower Parliament Street, Nottingham NG1 3DA**

Rob Percival, Area Planning Manager, presented application 22/00889/PFUL3 by Miss Kelly Paddick on behalf of Maven Property (Nottingham) LP , for full planning permission for an upward extension to an existing 2 storey building to create a building of 3- 5 storeys in height.

Rob Percival delivered a presentation which included indicative images of the proposal.

The following points were highlighted:

- (a) the proposal is for an upward extension of between one and three stories to create a building three to five stories in height (plus existing basement). The ground floor would be retained as retail use, with the upper floors used as 104 student bedspaces with a mixture of cluster and studio flats;
- (b) the proposal includes the removal and re-facading of the existing building, including the creation of new openings on the ground and first floor. The entrance to the student accommodation is on the southern elevation, accessed from the northern end of Thurland Street;
- (c) the proposal includes the retention of the existing ground floor retail provision and will refurbish part of the basement to provide retail storage space to compensate for the loss of the existing first floor storage space. Additionally, the scheme incorporates enhancements and the provision of infrastructure to the side elevations fronting Clinton Streets East and West to facilitate comprehensive street trader provision along both frontages;
- (d) the existing building is of poor architectural quality that is harmful to its immediate context and adjacent streets in particular. The proposed scheme, including the re-facading of the existing building, would transform the appearance of this property and functionally how it interacts with the adjacent streets;
- (e) the proposed materials are intended to create a building that is light in colour, comprising two tones on brickwork (the primary material), stone detailing, and light grey/blue terracotta cladding to the recessed upper floors. The windows, louvres and other elements of metalwork are to be finished in anodised aluminium, bronze in colour;
- (a) the first floor has a bridge which connects to the first floor of the Victoria Shopping Centre opposite. This bridge is not within the applicant's ownership and outside of the site boundary.

The following information was provided following questions and comments from members of the Committee:

- (b) the current building is extremely unattractive so it is good that it is being improved, as well as that the original structure is being retained and that a green roof is being incorporated;
- (c) the palate of colours for the brickwork is unclear from the renders. A lighter brick colour would be preferred to brighten the streetscape, particularly on Clinton Street;
- (d) it is unfortunate that the bridge to the Victoria Centre will remain but it is understood regarding the different ownership;

- (j) the complaints from the residents of the adjacent Crusader House are noted but not of sufficient weight to refuse the application.

**Resolved to**

**(1) grant planning permission subject to**

- i. a financial contribution of £122,481 towards off-site Public Open Space/Public Realm;**
- ii. targets associated with Local Employment and Training opportunities, including a financial contribution of £23,212;**
- iii. a financial contribution of £200,659 towards off-site affordable housing;**
- iv. a student management scheme which shall include a restriction on car usage.**

**(2) delegate power to determine the final details of the planning obligation and conditions of planning permission to the Director of Planning and Transport;**

**(3) confirm that the 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.**

**62 Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan - Preferred Approach**

Matt Gregory, Head of Planning Strategy and Geographic Information, presented the report and delivered a presentation for consultation on the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan, which has been approved for consultation by Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Rushcliffe Borough Councils. The following information was highlighted:

- (a) this is not the full version of the strategic plan (which will eventually replace the current Core Strategy) but focusses on the overarching strategy, housing numbers and distribution, and economic development. The next stage will include heritage, biodiversity, green belt and transport;
- (b) main principles of the strategy include blue and green infrastructure, promotion of urban living, and enhancement of quality of life;
- (c) a minimum of 49,900 homes are targeted between 2022 and 2038. Over half of these are proposed in the Nottingham City Council area. Strategic housing sites include the Boots site, Stanton Tip and the Broad Marsh area;
- (d) the Plan proposes to provide a range of sites for employment and economic development covering 234,500 square metres of office development and 21

hectares of industrial and warehousing space;

- (e) the Plan recognises the importance of the city centre, town centres, universities, existing employment land, and local employment and training;
- (f) a full draft of the Plan will be completed later this year which, subject to planning reform, is likely to be submitted for examination and subsequent adoption in 2024.

The following points were raised by the Committee during the discussion which followed:

- (g) it is difficult to plan long-term when expectations of travel, shopping and other services change regularly. The plan is reviewed on a 5 year cycle and is deliberately flexible to allow for change;
- (h) there is a shortage of housing so developing new sites such as Broad Marsh is positive but will require external funding. New housing must be as sustainable as possible;
- (i) there are some difficult retail sites in the city centre for which it will be difficult to find an alternative use, such as the former Debenhams building. These sites should be prioritised for development;
- (j) there is an ongoing pressure for student accommodation in the city. It makes sense to build this in the city centre and to avoid building on industrial sites on fringes of the city. The housing needs of older people also need to be considered in the city centre;

**Resolved to note the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan – Preferred Approach**