

**Report of Consultation**  
**SPDs and SCI**

**November 2019**

## **Contents**

1. Name of documents
2. Purpose of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)
3. Persons/bodies/groups consulted
4. Ways in which consultation was undertaken
5. Summary of the main issues identified and how they have been addressed
6. Sustainability Appraisal
7. Appendix 1 – Summary of comments and City Council response

## **1. Name of Documents**

- The Provision of Open Space in New Residential and Commercial Development SPD
- Management of Caves in Nottingham SPD
- Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

## **2. Purpose of the SPD**

The production of the above SPDs will help to ensure that development meets the Council's aspirations in terms of open space contributions and the protection of the City's caves, whilst a new and updated SCI will ensure the community are appropriately involved in the planning system.

SPDs are documents which add further detail to the policies in the Local Plan. They can be used to provide further guidance for development on specific sites, or on particular issues. SPDs are capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions but are not part of the statutory development plan.

The SPDs are supplementary to the Saved Policies of the Nottingham Local Plan (2005) and the Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategy (2014). It also aligns with the emerging Local Plan Part 2 (the Land and Planning Policies document, LAPP) The SPDs conform to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and once adopted will be a material consideration when determining planning applications.

## **3. Persons/bodies/groups consulted**

Consultation has been undertaken with statutory bodies, local businesses, citizens, wider interest groups and stakeholders, local councillors, and Nottingham City Council officers. Letters providing details of the consultation were sent to all contacts on the Local Plan database of consultees. A targeted consultation also captured specific interest groups relating to the document's subject matter (i.e. caves, open space) as well as known agents and developers within the City.

## **4. Ways in which consultation was undertaken**

Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the City Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Comments on the draft SPDs and SCI were invited for a 7 week period from 28 June to 16 August 2019.

Paper copies of the consultation documents and response forms were made available at the City Council's deposit points; Nottingham City Council's offices at Loxley House,

Station Street; The Local Studies Library, Nottingham Central Library, Angel Row; as well as at all other City Libraries.

The documents were available to view and download from the City Council's web site alongside downloadable response forms and an online response form. The consultation was also advertised on the Engage Nottingham Hub webpage...

## **5. Representations**

A total of 72 representation comments were received from 13 interested parties (made up of 10 organisations and 3 individuals) which were generally supportive. All comments have been considered and a number of changes to the SPDs and SCI are proposed as a result. A Report of Consultation which sets out the comments made, and the City Council's response to them, together with any recommended changes to the draft documents can be found at **Appendix 1**.

## **6. Sustainability Appraisal**

Undertaking a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a statutory requirement/process, which must be undertaken for any new planning document in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). The purpose of an SA is to assess the economic, social and environmental impacts of projects, strategies or plans, so that the preferred option promotes, rather than inhibits sustainable development. In addition to an SA, European directive 2001/42/EC (commonly referred to as Strategic Environmental Assessment or SEA), requires that Local Authorities undertake an "environmental assessment" of any plans and programmes they prepare that are likely to have a significant effect upon the environment.

The requirements of the SEA have been incorporated into the SA for the emerging Local Plan Part 2 (the Land and Planning Policies Document, LAPP). An SA was undertaken on the emerging Local Plan Part 2, therefore a separate SA is not required. The process has appraised social, environmental and economic effects. The SA has been undertaken from the start of the LAPP process through its various preparation stages. In doing so, it has helped to ensure that the decisions made on policies and allocations have contributed to achieving sustainable development. Furthermore, the SA has recommended some changes to help ensure that the LAPP is as sustainable as possible. The SA has facilitated the evaluation of alternatives and also considered the cumulative, synergistic and secondary impacts of the LAPP policies and sites.

The SA has also demonstrated that the plan is an appropriate approach when considering reasonable alternatives and, where negative impacts have been found, suggested suitable mitigation measures to try and overcome them. Monitoring

arrangements are also proposed to ensure that the impact of the policies can be properly evaluated.

Full details of the SA process, and methodology can be found at [www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan)

## Appendix 1 - Summary of comments and City Council response

Name	Summary of comments	NCC response
<b>Sport England</b>	<p>The SPD makes references to formal playing fields and sports facilities including private sports facilities - at para 3.6. Does the SPD include formal open space? Para 4.7 makes reference to school playing fields.</p>	<p>The SPD covers open space as defined in paragraph 3.7 and therefore includes formal open space.</p>
	<p>Section 5 makes no reference to the Playing Pitch Strategy as reviewed/updated in 2018. It is assumed that the Investment Plans were evidenced by the PPS para 6.34 suggests this.</p>	<p>Reference to the Playing Pitch Strategy 2018 to be included in new summary paragraph at 5.4. Following text inserted 'The 2018 Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan (PPS) updated the previous audit of the City's playing pitch provision and made recommendations for the upgrade of existing pitches and creation of new ones to meet identified shortfalls current and future demand. In 2019 a Local Football Facilities Plan (LFFP) was also produced. Recommendations from the PPS and LFFP will feed into future updates of the Parks and Open Spaces Investment Plans.'</p>
	<p>Para 6.16 - does this figure include sports pitches. You will be aware of the new development demand calculator (referenced in the PPS review) developed by Sport England which is intended to provide information on the</p>	<p>The formula does not include sports pitches. However, this does not prevent the City Council from spending s106 contributions on sports pitch provision in line with the Investment Plans. The</p>

	demand generated by a development by providing a locally derived assessment of local need. The PPS is then utilised to understand if the needs can be met. The calculator does not, however, include contributions from the business development.	following text has been inserted at paragraph 6.15 'It is intended that contributions will be spent on all types of open space improvements.'
	Does the SPD need to make reference to the priorities identified in the Local Football Facilities Plan? Which are intended to be delivered in partnership with some match funding	Yes, paragraph 5.4 references this.
	Sport England are happy to discuss the SPD further regarding contributions to outdoor sports facilities covered by the Playing Pitch Strategy.	Noted.
<b>Open Space Champions Group</b>	Broad strategy needed for the 5 strategic sites (Island Site, Waterside, North of City sites, Stanton Tip).	Agree. Suggest the following text is inserted at paragraph 3.5 'In respect of the following Local Plan sites: Island Site (PA68), Waterside (PA76, 77, 79, 80, 81. 82. 83, 85), and Stanton Tip (PA11), their scale necessitates a strategic approach to open space provision. Masterplanning will secure this and ensure that land ownerships and the phasing of development do not undermine or compromise such provision. The Local Plan also recognises the need to comprehensively coordinate open space provision across other sites that are in close proximity to each other such as PA3 - Eastglade, Top Valley, PA5 - Ridgeway, PA6- Beckhampton Road, PA8- Eastglade Road and PA9-Edwards Lane'.

	Need to ensure that masterplan is adhered to as phases of the development emerge. Needs something in SPD to address the issue of phases not delivering the vision intended at the outset.	Agree. Insert the following at paragraph 3.5 'Masterplanning will secure strategic open space provision and ensure that land ownerships and the phasing of development do not undermine or compromise such provision.'
	Execution is going to be the important. Need to embed these within our implementation/discussion with developers.	Agree. Implementation will be overseen by City Council Parks colleagues.
	Middle Hill to Maid Marian Way, need to change the landscape/townscape.	A number of complementary City Centre improvement initiatives will contribute to public realm enhancements. The Open Space SPD will allow S106 contributions to be secured from commercial developments in the City Centre which could contribute to such enhancements. No change to SPD proposed.
	What the process might be for briefing for Development Management staff.	Directorate Briefing sessions are used to brief Development Management staff and appropriate training sessions will be organised to brief DM colleagues.
	Planning Committee has a new wider focus, so now more scrutiny of these types of things at committee.	Noted.
	Document gives a sound policy basis.	Support noted.
<b>Member of the public</b>	Consultation draft is welcome.	Support noted.
	Detailed guidance is essential to ensure open space finds its proper place at the earliest opportunity in site design, and is kept there	Masterplanning and action plans will support this SPD and ensure that land ownerships, phasing of development and amendments to site layouts do not

	<p>despite competing elements and amendments to site layouts.</p>	<p>undermine or compromise open space provision.</p>
	<p>5 major developments sites need listing due to their size and vulnerability to the trend to treat open space as a luxury (Boots/City Link, Waterside, Stanton Tip, Southglade sites, Southern Regen sites). These needs to have a strategic planning brief to give open space proper priority. Consultation is inadequate at outline stage.</p>	<p>Agree. The following text has been inserted at paragraph 3.5; 'In respect of the following Local Plan sites: Island Site (PA68), Waterside (PA76, 77, 79, 80, 81. 82. 83, 85), and Stanton Tip (PA11), their scale necessitates a strategic approach to open space provision. Masterplanning will secure this and ensure that land ownerships and the phasing of development do not undermine or compromise such provision. The Local Plan also recognises the need to comprehensively coordinate open space provision across other sites that are in close proximity to each other such as PA3 - Eastglade, Top Valley, PA5 - Ridgeway, PA6 - Beckhampton Road, PA8 - Eastglade Road and PA9 -Edwards Lane'. Consultation will be undertaken in accordance with statutory regulations and in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.</p>
	<p>For proper open space provision the quantity, quality and siting of such space should be identified before any siting of buildings is finalised. There should be no diminution of amount: no change of character and no moving of it.</p>	<p>Agree. As stated in paragraph 6.14 'The design of open space is a fundamental part of the housing layout and must enable the open space to deliver the maximum number of benefits possible and encourage its use by the whole community.....'</p>

	<p>Quantity should be calculated with quality and siting. Accessible green space should be an integral part of the whole development and throughout it. Green corridors, pocket parks, pedestrian ways, water features, children`s play areas, green ways, boulevards, wildlife areas etc should all be features to be required as essential, identified and sited.</p>	<p>Agree. The definition of open space at paragraph 3.7 refers to such uses. Open space provision will be negotiated on a site by site basis and informed by the Investment Plans, the Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan and Football Facilities Plan, etc. Detailed design, layout and enhancements will be based on expertise and advice from City Council Parks colleagues.</p>
	<p>Open space which is not green should not be included in the calculation of quantity.</p>	<p>Disagree. The public realm is considered an important element of open space and is included in the definition of open space in the emerging Local Plan referenced at paragraph 3.7 in the SPD.</p>
	<p>In particular open space car parking is given high priority. Instead of taking up scarce and valuable green space car parking should be underground or above street level in new buildings. It is ironic that Nottingham was a pioneer in off street service parking when the Council House in 1927 with its underground servicing area for the ceremonial buildings ,offices and shopping arcade not much repeated since then.</p>	<p>Car parking is not considered under the definition of open space at paragraph 3.7. However, opportunities to 'green' car parking may be secured under other emerging Local Plan policies such as Policy CC1: Sustainable Design and Construction.</p>
	<p>A trend in other cities which Nottingham has escaped is gated developments. As this is becoming more fashionable elsewhere it would be helpful, although stating the obvious perhaps, that these will be discouraged.</p>	<p>This is beyond the scope of this SPD. However, design policies in the emerging Local Plan such as DE1: Building Design and Use and DE2: Context and Place making allow DM officers to consider this matter at planning application stage.</p>

	<p>Similarly all highways including cycle and footways should be declared public rights of way; not restricted to concessionary or private rights.</p>	<p>This is beyond scope of this SPD. However, 'Managing Travel Demand' policies in the emerging Local Plan seek to secure sustainable transport measures such as walking and cycling as part of development proposals and can be used by DM colleagues at planning application stage.</p>
	<p>For the more imaginative developers a word of encouragement would not go amiss for open spaces whether public or private to be above ground level where feasible such as apartment blocks and commercial buildings. There is nothing new about these. The garden of the Victoria Flats recently improved is a good precedent for modest 'hanging gardens'.</p>	<p>Agree. The emerging Biodiversity SPD and Local Plan policies provide guidance on such matters and are referenced in this Open Space SPD.</p>
	<p>One of the difficulties in taking a strategic approach to open space provision is when there is more than one landowner. Usually each will want to maximise their own investment. As there is little such value in open space the City Council should act as broker to organise land swaps or other financial balancings where there are such differences in land values. (Could the 106 process do this?). Some indication in this SPD of such facilitation would avoid some of the impasses and create a more positive approach in some cases particularly some of the large sites.</p>	<p>Agree. The following has been inserted at paragraph 3.5 'In respect of the following Local Plan sites: Island Site (PA68), Waterside (PA76, 77, 79, 80, 81. 82. 83, 85), and Stanton Tip (PA11), their scale necessitates a strategic approach to open space provision. Masterplanning will secure this and ensure that land ownerships and the phasing of development do not undermine or compromise such provision. The Local Plan also recognises the need to comprehensively coordinate open space provision across other sites that are in close proximity to each other such as PA3</p>

		- Eastglade, Top Valley, PA5 - Ridgeway, PA6 - Beckhampton Road, PA8 - Eastglade Road and PA9 -Edwards Lane'.
	The SPD should be used as the guidance to developers to instil the notion that open space, particularly green space, is as important as built space. All the excellent principles set out in the SPD will only be effective if they are underpinned by detailed criteria. `The devil is in the detail`.	Noted. Once adopted, the SPD will be a material consideration in planning applications where appropriate.
	Developers who are committed to good design for open space will draw comfort from detailed guidance in combating the baleful influence and competition of the others.	Noted.
<b>Nottingham Local Access Forum</b>	Supportive of adoption of the SPD as it is closely aligned with a key, statutorily defined, function of the forum.	Support noted.
	Trust that the various formulae and constants put forward in the SPD to be used in the calculation of requirements for open space in developments are robust, so as to be defensible in the event of challenge from developers.	Yes. Calculations are based on the real life cost of open space provision as calculated by Parks colleagues. There have been no challenges to the formula in consultation responses.
	Para 3.5 - replace 'should' with 'shall'.	3.5 - disagree, keep as 'should' as directing people to consider both SPDs.
	Para 4.9 - replace 'should' with 'shall'.	Keeping as 'should' as directing people to what they should consider.
	Para 6.7 - replace 'arguably' with 'considered'.	The word 'arguably' has been deleted.

	Para 6.12 - replace 'up to' with 'for'.	Text amended to read "...will also be subject to payment of commuted sums covering a maintenance period of 25-30 years."
	Para 6.14 - replace 'should' with 'must'.	Propose insertion of 'is' in place of 'should be' to satisfy comment.
	Para 6.18 - replace 'should' with 'must also'.	6.18 - this paragraph does not contain a 'should', assume might have meant para 6.28 - 'should' has been replaced with "must also".
	The suggested changes are intended to provide clarity in dealing with developers and to assist officers with enforcement where developers are reluctant without good reason.	Noted.
<b>Historic England</b>	No comment on SPD.	Noted.
<b>Severn Trent</b>	Supportive of the inclusion of paragraph 4.8 bullet point c. Whilst we are supportive of the benefits provided by open space, some open space areas could also provide flood risk or surface water management benefits without detracting from their primary function. It is important that these benefits are recognised and that planning policy does not prevent the retrofitting of SuDS or flood resilience scheme from being incorporated within open space. Where SuDS are introduced into open spaces correctly there is also the possibility of additional biodiversity and amenity benefits being delivered.	Support noted. Biodiversity and amenity benefits of SUDs are referenced in the Open Space SPD at para 3.8 and in the emerging Biodiversity SPD.

<p><b>Nottingham Open Spaces Forum</b></p>	<p>p3 Foreword - could “and enhance” be added to line 1 para 2 after “continue to maintain” references to such an aspiration through the document and would be helpful to highlight in foreword.</p>	<p>Agree. 'and enhance' has been added to the Foreword.</p>
	<p>p.5 3.5. 2nd para replace “can” with “should” in relation to increasing biodiversity.</p> <p>Would also like to see some reference to need to increase climate change resilience in this regard.</p>	<p>Disagree as some types of open space provision such as public realm and formal playing pitch provision may not increase biodiversity.</p> <p>Agree. Paragraph 3.8 has been amended to read: "Providing open space will not only help to meet the requirements of this SPD, but can also contribute to the aim of increasing biodiversity and developing climate change resilience in the City. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, for example, can, contribute to open space provision, increase biodiversity, and reduce surface water run-off/flooding. The Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document provides additional guidance on open space provision and should be considered alongside this Open Space SPD."</p>

	p.12 5.0 Could there be mention of recommended Accessible Greenspace Standards	Agree. The following text has been inserted into the SPD at paragraph 5.3 "In relation to this, the Council has adopted a hierarchy of open space, and applied the following accessibility standards for the City's population; a Destination site within 5km, a City site within 1km, a Neighbourhood site within 800m and a Local site within 600m – across all typologies."
	p.13 6.6 "Need to provide..." should include measures to enhance biodiversity.	Agree. Reference made to Biodiversity SPD.
	p.13 6.7 Would like to remove "arguably".	'The word 'arguably' has been deleted.
	p.14 6.10 Again some reference to accessible greenspace standards?	Agree. Footnote inserted at paragraph 6.10.
	p.15 6.14 Paragraph to include reference to need to enhance biodiversity on a net gain basis.	Para 6.14 has been amended to include reference to biodiversity.
	p.18 6.24 "Commercial contribution will only be applied ....." Seems at the very least an arguable assumption that "those who live within the city will already have contributed"	The assumption is considered to be reasonable in the context of appropriate levels of S106 contributions.
	p.18 6.25 Again an arguable assumption that employees will not use all types of open space?	The assumption is considered to be reasonable in the context of appropriate levels of S106 contributions.
<b>Natural England</b>	Natural England welcome the quantifiable strategic approach taken to deal with the issue of poor quality open space in Nottingham. Natural England recognise that on site open space provision is not always possible however there are measures that can be taken to provide alternatives to traditional open space like biodiversity rich roof gardens or terraces. It	Noted. The SPD makes reference to these matters. Off site open space provision will be informed by Investment Plans which highlight local green space priorities etc.

	<p>would also be more beneficial to residents if offsite green space is located as near as possible to the proposed development.</p>	
	<p>Natural England would like to highlight the synergies between the Open Space SPD and the Biodiversity SPD, there is an opportunity to create efficiencies by developing open space that provides a range of beneficial functions. Multi-functional green infrastructure (GI) can perform a range of functions including improved flood risk management, provision of accessible green space, climate change adaptation, biodiversity enhancement that reduces fragmentation, improve air quality and attenuating noise, local food production, contribute to a sense of place, contribute to economic assets and improve the quality of life, health and well-being of residents.</p>	<p>Noted. There are a number of cross-references to the emerging Biodiversity SPD in the Open Space SPD.</p>
	<p>Green infrastructure can embrace a range of spaces and assets that provide environmental and wider benefits. It can, for example, include parks, playing fields, other areas of open space, woodland, allotments, community orchards and gardens, private gardens, sustainable drainage features, green roofs and walls, street trees and 'blue infrastructure' such as streams, ponds, canals and other water bodies.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD covers this point in its definition of open space at paragraph 3.7.</p>
	<p>Additional evidence and case studies on green infrastructure, including the economic benefits of GI can be found on the Natural England's website. The landscape Institute has also publish a</p>	<p>Web links to Natural England and the Landscape websites have been included in the SPD under 'Further Information'.</p>

	position statement to highlight a range of successful strategic GI work and completed projects that may be beneficial to highlight in the SPD.	
<b>Notts Wildlife Trust</b>	There is no guidance in terms of the balance in relation to type of open space and how much of it will be wildlife / natural habitat. We would like it be made clear that, in some circumstances, contributions should be used to support existing natural sites, such as the city's Local Nature Reserve Network and, ideally, support creation of additional LNRs. This is in addition to creation of new habitats/ informal green infrastructure, where appropriate and the requirement for 'net' biodiversity gain in NPPF.	The SPD makes a number of cross references to the emerging Biodiversity SPD which covers this point.
	Enhancement is an aspiration we all share for Nottingham's open spaces and the word should be used in the Foreword.	Text amended to include "and enhance" after "continue to maintain" reference in the Foreword.
	We consider wildlife and biodiversity so important that it should be mentioned in the opening paragraph, rather than left until second paragraph of 3.5 and 3.6 (which is quoted from another plan).	Agree. Have inserted 'It also contributes to the City's wildlife habitat/biodiversity' at para 3.1.
	We consider experiencing wildlife so important that it should be mentioned in this paragraph 3.3, rather than left until paragraph 3.5 and 3.6 (which is quoted from another plan).	After "open and green spaces", 'and experiencing nature and wildlife' has been added' to paragraph 3.3.
	Paragraph 3.5 - recommend replacing 'should' with 'will' in the sentence "The Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document should be considered alongside this Open Space SPD".	Disagree. Text to be kept as 'should'.

	Paragraph 5.2 - highlight that sites exist (and are still a fantastic resource) and can be of value, especially biodiversity, even if they haven't been submitted for Green Flag Assessment.	Whilst it is recognised that non Green Flag open space is valued locally and can have wildlife value, the statement is factual and no amendment is proposed.
	Question why the Council can't aim for 5.4ha of open space per 1000 people, rather than 2.4ha, and why is it restricted to the parks and gardens element when other typologies are important. In view of other authority's open space standards, NWT are concerned that the open space requirements put forward in Nottingham are too low.	There is already a significant amount of open space in the City. The formula is intended to secure an appropriate level of S106 contributions in the context of the needs of new development.
	Natural England published guidance on access to Greenspaces - 'Nature Nearby' Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance in addition to the 2.4ha per 1000 people parks and gardens requirement.	Natural England website is now referenced in the Open Space SPD. The Council's accessibility standards are detailed at paragraph 5.3.
<b>Nottingham City Council Planning Committee</b>	The Committee suggested that guidance should be given on how to provide and maintain good connectivity for mobile devices across open spaces through an appropriate policy document.	LAPP Policy IN1: Telecommunications seeks to ensure acceptable provision of telecommunications technology therefore it is unnecessary to cover in this SPD.
<b>Nottingham City Councillor</b>	Request that document be amended to refer to appropriate Council pledges, e.g. zero carbon, bee-friendly city, etc.	Open Space SPD needs to cross reference the benefits open space has in terms of reducing its carbon footprint. Amendments made to Foreword and new text at paragraph 3.4 as follows; 'The City Council recognises the importance of open space and aspires to create a 'bee friendly' city with suitable habitats in every neighbourhood. It considers that high quality open space will also contribute to

		reducing carbon to help make Nottingham a carbon neutral city.'
--	--	---

### Management of Caves of Nottingham SPD

<b>Name</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>City Council response</b>
<b>Historic England</b>	Historic England welcomes the policy approach to caves through the specific Local Plan Part 2 policy. The content of the draft SPD on the management of caves in Nottingham will be a positive support to the existing Local Plan policy.	Support noted.
<b>Severn Trent</b>	No specific comments on the SPD.	Comments noted.
<b>Nottingham City Council Planning Committee</b>	The Committee suggested that this SPD and/or technical guide should include information on appropriate uses for caves, such as for hydroponics.	The Technical Guide will include this level of detailed information.
<b>Natural England</b>	Welcome the development of the SPD and has no comments.	Noted.

## Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

Name	Summary of comments	City Council response
<b>Natural England</b>	Unable to give a detailed respons but supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters, both in terms of shaping policy and participating in the process of determining planning applications.	Support noted.
<b>Highways England</b>	<p>Endorse the approach set out in the SCI whereby developers and applicants are strongly encouraged to engage with Highways England at an early stage. In our experience pro-active pre-application discussions with Highways England, where relevant, provides the applicant with the opportunity to address considerations or concerns prior to the submission of the application, thus streamlining the process. We currently have a close working relationship with Planning Officers and Traffic Officers within the local authority and believe the majority of applications which will affect the SRN are currently highlighted to us at an early stage of the planning process. We will seek to continue this effective relationship moving forwards.</p> <p>Highways England has produced a document titled The Strategic Road Network: Planning for the Future which is a guide to working with Highways England on planning matters. Where relevant, Nottingham City Council should guide applicants to this document at the earliest possible opportunity. It can be found in the following location: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/at">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/at</a></p>	Support noted. The Strategic Road Network document has been highlighted with Development Management section. Reference to specified Highways England document, and links to the Highways and Environment Agency's websites have been added at paragraph 5.2.5.

	tachment_data/file/461023 /N150227_- _Highways_England_Planning_Document_FINAL-lo.pdf	
<b>Historic England</b>	The Local Plan stages are noted but, on the basis that some stages are indicated as being optional, it is recommended that the associated Regulation 18 and 19 requirements are linked to the relevant stages for clarity and the avoidance of doubt. The Neighbourhood Plan section relates to community involvement but the approach to statutory consultees is not clear. It is recommended that this be addressed through inclusion of some additional short text. Appendix A sets out English Heritage in the Duty to Co-operate list but does not refer to Historic England which should be included in the list.	Suggested minor changes considered to be appropriate. Revised paragraph 2.7.1 sets out T&CP Act 2012 Regulations 18, 19, 20 and 22. Revised paragraph 4.2.1 provides additional commentary on Neighbourhood Planning consultation. 'Historic England' added to Appendix A.
<b>Nottingham City Council Planning Committee</b>	The Committee suggest that, to ensure that citizens were made aware of planning applications and documents in good time to react to them, guidance should be included on how to make the best use of social media to communicate the information as widely and as rapidly as possible.	Agree. Chapter 10 paragraphs 10.1.1 to 10.1.5 set out the online means of accessing planning information and providing comments.
<b>Severn Trent</b>	Supportive of the inclusion of the following bullet point within paragraph 2.4.2 “‘Specific Consultation Bodies’ which include statutory authorities such as neighbouring districts, government agencies and utility providers.” Severn Trent are happy to support the development of planning policy and respond to consultations on individual planning applications, helping to ensure that the most appropriate and sustainable developments are brought forward. We are supportive of the inclusion of Sewerage undertakers and water undertakers within the Specific Consultation bodies list that forms part of Appendix A.	Support noted.

<b>Nottingham Open Spaces Forum</b>	p.12 3.1.1 SPDS should or will be a material consideration etc. rather than can? p.21 5.5.1 Could there be some explanation/example of the circumstances in which particular means of notification apply? p.25 6.2 & 6.3 Again perhaps some explanation/example of criteria for determination why planning committee rather than officers?	SPDs relevant to specific issues are a material consideration, therefore reference to 'may' is retained. The commentary for applications determined by Planning Committee (paragraph 6.3.1) has been expanded.
-------------------------------------	--	--