

19/02589/HYBRID

Applicant Nottingham Forest Football Club Ltd (NFFC)

Location Nottingham Forest Football Club City Ground (Including Champions Centre, Club Shop and Storage Warehouse, And Rowing Club Britannia Boathouse) Pavilion Road West Bridgford Nottinghamshire

Proposal Hybrid planning application comprising Full planning permission for the redevelopment of the Peter Taylor stand (including the demolition of existing buildings/structures), new public realm, replacement club shop, car parking and associated works, and Outline planning permission for up to 170 residential units including flexible uses (Class E) at ground floor (approval for access, layout and scale)

Ward Trent Bridge

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Adjacent Ward Member (Nottingham City)

RECEIVED FROM: Cllr S Battlemuch (Wollaton West Labour Cllr)

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- Significant benefits for the local economy
- New jobs in construction and new permanent jobs linked to the new stand
- Extra capacity in the ground brings new fans
- Good for local people who want to see their local Club but also when ground is used for other matches which brings more visitors to the area
- Benefits both Rushcliffe and wider city/county

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The economic benefits of the proposed scheme can be reviewed in detail within the committee reports paragraphs 369 – 388.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Local resident

RECEIVED FROM: Mr Peter Vallely

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- Strongly supportive of the proposed redevelopment
- Resistance to the proposed redevelopment would have profound ramifications for the local economy
- The Club require greater spectator capacity to hold onto Premier League status
- Concerns raised that rejection of the application would result in The Club relocating elsewhere
- Objections that have already been raised are insurmountable and are rooted in the resistance to the football club growing its footprint
- Developing key community asset is supported

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The economic benefits of the proposed scheme can be reviewed in detail within the committee reports paragraphs 369 – 388.

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Local resident

RECEIVED FROM: Mr Alan Coole

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- Lady Bay is already treated as an overspill car park on match days. Since promotion to Premier League this has gotten worse
- Lady Bay 20mph speed zone is ignored by supporters
- Concerns that the additional capacity will cause further unsafe on street parking which will harm residents
- Recent introduction of parking restrictions on Holme Road and Hook car park has made no difference
- Emergency vehicles unable to pass which causes delay, disruption and potential loss of life
- When challenged regarding poor parking, supporters are aggressive to residents
- Concerned that the Highways Authority have not objected to the application
- The project can only receive approval when plans for increase in public transportation, parking space provision, inducements for spectators arriving without cars, match day signage, changes to double yellow lines and liaison with the community have been undertaken.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The issues in relation to the impact of the proposal on the highway network and in terms of parking are considered in detail within the committee report paragraphs

299 – 368. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways only removed their initial objection on the basis of the extensive mitigation measures and Section 106 monies proposed by the applicant for both the replacement stand and the residential element of the scheme, all of which are detailed within the committee report.

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Adjacent Ward Members (Nottingham City)

RECEIVED FROM: Cllr M Edwards and Cllr E Regan (Meadows Ward)

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The residents will want to see Nottingham Forest stay at the City ground
- Most significant issue for residents of The Meadows is parking on match days
- Many residents are having to seek parking permits to try and mitigate parking issues from supporters
- There is a lack of confidence in parking enforcement during match days
- Concerns that the parking permits don't protect residents on Sundays, bank holidays and certain times of the day
- Increasing the ground capacity will make problems of illegal/ inconsiderate parking worse
- Raises concerns with pedestrian safety before and post matches, and expect proactive action should the capacity at the ground be increased
- Comment that they are pleased to see S106 monies for pedestrian crossing improvements to London Road/ Cattle Market Junction
- Make comment on future plans for trams and bus routes in the area
- Comment that they don't know where the extra parking requirements will be provided
- Raise concerns as to whether there would be sufficient space for cycles and e-scooter parking
- Pleased to see the Travel Plans that have been submitted to mitigate the concerns raised.
- Change in modal shift for supporters requires determination and communication by The Club
- In terms of green energy, comment that the proposed stand should include solar panels
- Concerns that the proposed residential element could spoil the view along the river

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Issues in relation to the impact of the proposal on the highway network and in terms of parking are considered in detail within the committee report paragraphs 299 – 368. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways only removed their initial objection

on the basis of the extensive mitigation measures and Section 106 monies proposed by the applicant for both the replacement stand and the residential element of the scheme, all of which are detailed within the committee report.

There is no e-scooter parking proposed as part of the development for the replacement Peter Taylor stand but there would be an increase in cycle storage from 24 to 30 spaces to accommodate the proposed increase in capacity (see paragraph 311 of the committee report).

In terms of the proposed view along the river, the design of both elements of the scheme have been considered at length within paragraphs 238 – 280 of the committee report. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposals would change the key views and vistas along the river, overall, it is considered that the scheme has been well-designed and is in a location that can accommodate tall buildings. The appearance of the residential element of the scheme is a reserved matter and would be considered under a future reserved matters application, should outline permission be granted.

Consideration of sustainability is included at paragraphs 562 – 571 of the committee report.

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional Consultee comments

RECEIVED FROM: RBC Conservation

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- They have become aware of a degree of inconsistency between condition 10 which requires building recording of the boathouse and the identification of the building as a non-designated heritage asset
- The demolition of the boathouse would not harmfully affect the setting of any adjacent listed buildings or the local area given that its architectural character is one of its weaker elements, and its demolition has been justified within the proposals and would facilitate other benefits for the scheme overall.
- A building does not need to possess value within all of the elements of heritage significance as defined in the NPPF glossary and expanded upon within the NPPG to be recognised as a non-designated heritage asset, and given the relative strength of its historic interest it is appropriate for the building to be considered as a non-designated heritage asset.
- Whilst its loss is justified and it is considered that a balanced judgement should conclude that benefits of the wider proposals would outweigh the high level of harm (loss) to this relatively modest non-designated heritage asset following application of the balance required within paragraph 216 of the NPPF.

- Whilst acknowledging that the ability to record significance is not a justification for allowing harm or loss as stated in paragraph 218 of the NPPF its significance should first be recorded before its demolition occurs.
- Given that a sizable component of that significance is historical a record requiring a relatively detailed written assessment and record which can go beyond recording the bare fabric of the building should be secured.
- Whilst the buildings architectural significance is limited it is certainly possible that in dismantling the building elements of original fabric may be uncovered which might not otherwise be encountered or known about and as such a record of the buildings fabric would still have legitimate purpose and should still be secured to a reasonably robust degree.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The revised comments confirm that the Britannia Boathouse is identified as a non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 484 of the committee report is therefore incorrect.

As the building has now been identified as an NDHA, the tests within Paragraph 216 of the NPPF needs to be appropriately considered. Paragraph 216 states:

'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'

In considering paragraph 216 of the NPPF, the boathouse is a relatively modest non-designated heritage asset and its demolition would facilitate the proposed replacement stand and public plaza area of the proposed development. It is considered that, when taking a balanced judgment, that the benefits that the scheme brings far outweighs the loss of the non-designated heritage asset in this case. However, as per paragraph 218 of the NPPF, it is considered appropriate to include a condition in any forthcoming permission which requires the recording of the building's significance prior to its demolition. This condition has been included within the committee report as Condition 10.

6. NATURE OF REPRESENTATION: Note from Planning Officer

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Condition 45 should be amended to refer to the correct condition number, being 44 instead of condition 43. The initial wording of the condition in the committee report is as follows:

'The residential and commercial facilities as part of the outline consent area (the

extent of which are defined on the 'Proposed Site Block Plan & Existing Stand Outline - Plan Ref: BNY-SA-00-00-04 Rev: B08') shall not be brought into use or, occupied, until, a Travel Plan Coordinator has been appointed who shall be responsible for the implementation, delivery, monitoring and promotion of the sustainable transport initiatives set out in the updated Travel Plan as approved in condition 43, and whose details shall be provided and continue to be provided when requested thereafter to the Local Planning Authority.

[Reason: To promote sustainable travel having regard to Policy 14 (Managing Travel Demand) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014)].

The wording of condition 45 has been amended to the following and should be updated as part of the recommendation as follows:

'The residential and commercial facilities as part of the outline consent area (the extent of which are defined on the 'Proposed Site Block Plan & Existing Stand Outline - Plan Ref: BNY-SA-00-00-04 Rev: B08') shall not be brought into use or, occupied, until, a Travel Plan Coordinator has been appointed who shall be responsible for the implementation, delivery, monitoring and promotion of the sustainable transport initiatives set out in the updated Travel Plan as approved in condition 44, and whose details shall be provided and continue to be provided when requested thereafter to the Local Planning Authority.

[Reason: To promote sustainable travel having regard to Policy 14 (Managing Travel Demand) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014)].