

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

The Provision of Open Space in New Residential and Commercial Development



May 2026

Report of Consultation



**Nottingham
City Council**

Contents

1.0	Introduction and Purpose of the Report of Consultation	1
2.0	Persons/bodies/groups consulted	1
3.0	Ways in which consultation was undertaken	2
4.0	Representations	2
Table 1: Summary of Comments Received, Officer Responses and Proposed Changes		3
	Nottingham Open Space Forum (Ben Hunt).....	3
	Pelham Architects (Simon Henderson).....	4
	Historic England (Kezia Taylerson)	4
	Local resident (1)	4
	Local resident (2)	4

1.0 Introduction and Purpose of the Report of Consultation

- 1.1 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) 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.
- 1.2 The purpose of this SPD is to provide clear and up-to-date guidance on how Nottingham City Council will secure open space provision from new residential and commercial development. It explains how Policies EN2 and IN4 of the Local Plan Part 2, along with relevant Core Strategy policies, should be applied in practice covering the type, amount and quality of open space required, and the circumstances in which on-site provision or financial contributions are appropriate.
- 1.3 A review of the SPD is necessary because the previous guidance had become outdated, with older methodologies and contribution figures no longer reflecting current costs or evidence. This revision updates the calculations, aligns them with the latest evidence and national planning requirements, and ensures the approach remains consistent, transparent and effective in supporting high-quality open spaces across the city.

This Report of Consultation (RofC) provides a transparent record of the engagement process undertaken during the development of the revised SPD, demonstrating how the Council has fulfilled its legal obligations and how feedback from the community and stakeholders has informed the final guidance. It summarises the comments received during the consultation period and sets out the City Council's responses, including any recommended changes to the SPD where necessary. While it does not attempt to capture every point made nor address issues outside the scope of the consultation it explains the main changes made in response to consultation feedback and, where no changes have been made, the reasons for this.

2.0 Persons/bodies/groups consulted

- 2.1 Consultation has been undertaken with statutory bodies, local businesses, citizens, agents and developers, wider interest groups and stakeholders, local councillors, and Nottingham City Council officers. Emails and letters providing details of the consultation were sent to all contacts on the Local Plan database of consultees.

3.0 Ways in which consultation was undertaken

- 3.1 Consultation was undertaken in line with the City Council's [Statement of Community Involvement](#) (SCI). The SPD was available to view and download from the City Council's website alongside an online response form. Copies of the SPD were also available at both Loxley House and Central Library. Emails and letters were sent to interested parties as set out in section 2. The consultation was also advertised on the Nottingham City's [Engage Nottingham Hub](#).
- 3.2 Comments on the draft SPD were invited between from **6 February to 6 March 2026**, complying with the [four week requirement](#) set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

4.0 Representations

- 4.1 Five representations were received from five interested parties. Table 1 sets out a summary of the comments made, the City Council's responses to them, and any recommended changes to the revised SPD. Of the five consultees, four provided substantive comments and one (Historic England) confirmed they had no comments to raise.
- 4.2 The substantive comments raised included: proposals outside the scope of the SPD (two local residents), concerns regarding the accuracy of referenced use classes (Nottingham Open Space Forum), and issues relating to the viability of open space contributions, particularly for affordable housing (Pelham Architects). As a result of the consultation, one change is proposed to the SPD with an amendment to paragraph 6.22 to correct use class terminology. Minor proofing changes have also been made, and one non-substantive wording correction to paragraph 6.27 to address a technical issue.
- 4.3 To support an efficient and timely analysis of consultation responses, the Council has made use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to help organise and summarise the comments received in this report. These tools were used solely to improve efficiency and reduce administrative processing time. All original comments were read and reviewed by Council officers, and all AI generated summaries were subsequently checked, verified, and where necessary amended by officers to ensure accuracy, impartiality, and full alignment with the representations submitted.

Table 1: Summary of Comments Received, Officer Responses and Proposed Changes

Summary of comments	City Council response	Proposed Changes
Nottingham Open Space Forum (Ben Hunt)		
<p>The consultee raises concerns that the SPD incorrectly refers to “<i>the old B1 use class order</i>” and “<i>the old B2 and B8 use class order,</i>” noting that the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 is still in force, albeit amended over time. They highlight that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1, B2 and B8 are <i>use classes within the Order</i>, not separate “orders”. • Amendments to classes—particularly Class B2—create the risk of ambiguity if not clearly referenced. • Classes B2 and B8 remain present in Schedule 1 and therefore should not be described as “old”. • Although Class B1 no longer applies in England, its reference in the SPD could confuse readers because the relevant use class is now Class E(g). <p>To ensure accuracy and avoid ambiguity, the consultee suggests replacing the current SPD text with the following wording:</p> <p>“A contribution towards open space will therefore be negotiated from all developments for new office, research and development of products and processes, and light industry appropriate in a residential area (developments that would fall under Class E(g) of the Use Classes Order) where that development would involve over 1000 square metres gross internal floorspace. Other</p>	<p>Comments noted and agreed to amend the text.</p>	<p>Revised wording for paragraph 6.22: “A contribution towards open space will therefore be negotiated from all developments for new office, research and development of products and processes, and light industry appropriate in a residential area (developments that would fall under Class E(g) of the Use Classes Order) where that development would involve over 1,000 square metres (sq. m) gross internal floorspace. Other new commercial developments - e.g. for general industry not appropriate in a residential area, and storage or distribution (falling under Classes B2 or B8 of the Use Classes Order) and retail developments will not be required to contribute as these would not be considered to generate significant new need for open space.”</p>

Summary of comments	City Council response	Proposed Changes
<p>new commercial developments - e.g. for general industry not appropriate in a residential area, and storage or distribution (falling under Classes B2 or B8 of the Use Classes Order) and retail developments will not be required to contribute as these would not be considered to generate significant new need for open space.”</p>		
Pelham Architects (Simon Henderson)		
<p>The consultee raises concerns that the SPD does not differentiate between affordable housing and market housing in relation to open space contributions. They note that while they seek to provide on-site open space wherever possible, the proposed thresholds for off-site contributions could make some schemes—particularly those with a high proportion of affordable homes—unviable. They also state that the contribution level for a three-bed property (£3,600) is likely to be challenged through viability assessment and suggest that a lower figure may be more achievable.</p>	<p>The comments are noted. However, the issues raised relate to wider policy matters and fall outside the scope of the proposed modifications to the SPD. The SPD does not introduce differentiated financial requirements for affordable housing, as doing so would create inconsistencies in the application of adopted Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Existing Local Plan policies already allow for viability assessments where an applicant considers that the required contributions would make a scheme unviable. Any submitted evidence will be assessed in line with established policy and national guidance. No further changes to the SPD are therefore proposed.</p>	None
Historic England (Kezia Taylerson)		
Do not have any comments to raise.	Noted.	None
Local resident (1)		
<p>The consultee suggests utilising Traditional Architecture Design Codes for all new construction with a ban on demolition of all buildings constructed prior to 1950.</p>	<p>The matters raised extend beyond the proposed modifications to the SPD and are therefore outside the scope of this consultation.</p>	None
Local resident (2)		
<p>The consultee suggests that Nottingham City Airport should be re-opened, arguing that doing so would provide a large open green space,</p>	<p>The matters raised extend beyond the proposed modifications to the SPD and are therefore outside the scope of this consultation.</p>	None

Summary of comments	City Council response	Proposed Changes
enhance transport infrastructure, and restore a valued leisure facility, all of which they believe could be achieved at minimal cost.		