



Appeal Decisions

Inquiry Held on 8-15 June 2021

Site visit made on 17 June 2021

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 August 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/Q3060/W/21/3267115

**Land off Edenbridge Court, Bramcote, Nottingham. Easting 451836
Northing 338587**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Bramcote Unity Park Charitable Incorporated Organisation against the decision of City of Nottingham Council.
- The application Ref 19/01564/PFUL3, dated 11 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2020.
- The development proposed is described as "a new community park comprising footpaths, 1072 new trees, recreation, education and biodiversity infrastructure and facilities together with enabling works comprising 11 dwellings".

Appeal B Ref: APP/J3015/W/21/3267117

**Land off Edenbridge Court, Bramcote, Nottingham. Easting 451836
Northing 338587**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Bramcote Unity Park Charitable Incorporated Organisation against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/00465/FUL, dated 11 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2020.
- The development proposed is described as "a new community park comprising footpaths, 1072 new trees, recreation, education and biodiversity infrastructure and facilities together with enabling works comprising 11 dwellings".

Decisions

1. Both appeals are dismissed.

Application for costs

2. At the Inquiry an application for costs was made by Broxtowe Borough and Nottingham City Councils against Bramcote Unity Park Charitable Incorporated Organisation. An application was also made for costs by Bramcote Unity Park Charitable Incorporated Organisation against Broxtowe Borough and Nottingham City Councils. These applications are the subject of separate Decisions.

Procedural Matter

3. Since the Inquiry the Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been revised and a new version was published in July 2021. Both parties have been

given an opportunity to comment on the new Framework. I have taken these comments and the revised Framework into account in my decision.

Background

4. The site is a privately owned area of woodland on Bramcote Ridge which is situated between two public open spaces known as the Alexandrina Planation Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Sandy Lane LNR. Further beyond the Alexandrina Plantation LNR lies the Deddington Plantation. It was an aspiration of the appellant to link all these open spaces together under an integrated management plan and the total woodland area would become known, perhaps, as "Bramcote Unity Park". However, these three other areas are not under the control of the appellant and there is no mechanism before me to enable this vision. Therefore, I have considered the proposal in so far as it relates to the appeal site.
5. The proposal is to provide a public park to be managed by a charitable organisation which would secure the existing public access, long term management, public liability insurance and future funding. In addition, other things would be provided such as footpaths, which the appellant says would be accessible for people with disabilities, a woodland play area, benches, community beehives, bins, bird hide, a defibrillator, an outdoor classroom and sculptures. The proposal also involves the removal of a significant amount of Japanese Knotweed.
6. The creation of the park and the removal of the Japanese Knotweed would be funded by the erection of 11 dwellings, nine of which would be in the Nottingham City Council (NCC) area, accessed off Edenbridge Court and two would be in the Broxtowe Borough Council (BBC) area, accessed off Sandy Lane. The two areas of housing would be physically separate to each other. The planning applications were considered separately by each local planning authority, hence the two separate appeals. However, the proposal is presented as one overall scheme.
7. The development Plan for the area is Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2014) (ALS) for both authorities. In addition, for the Nottingham area it is the Nottingham Local Plan Part 2 – Land and Planning Policies (2020) (LAPP) and for the Broxtowe area it is the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan (2019) (BLP)

Main Issues

8. The main issues are the effect of the proposals on the (i) character and appearance of the area; (ii) living conditions of the occupiers of existing nearby dwellings in respect of outlook, light and community cohesion and whether the living conditions of future residents would be acceptable in respect of safety, pedestrian access and waste collection; (iii) nature conservation (local wildlife site, habitats and biodiversity) and (iv) Green Infrastructure Asset and Open Space Network.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

9. In the NCC area, the nine dwellings would be large and detached with generous spacing between them. The developed area would stretch between

- Richborough Place and Maidstone Drive which are located off Appledore Avenue. There are additional cul-de-sacs off Appledore Avenue and adjacent to the appeal site between these two roads.
10. The land upon which the nine houses would be constructed is dense woodland and scrub which slopes up from the heads of the cul-de-sacs. It forms a green area at the urban fringe and is part of the prominent woodland area of the Bramcote ridgeline which is seen in wide ranging views in the locality. This woodland is part of a wider area of green and undeveloped land separating the built-up areas of Nottingham and Broxtowe and forms a strong and dominant wooded backdrop to the urban area.
 11. I have had regard to the appellant's Landscape and Visual Character assessment which has identified viewpoints towards the ridge which are quite far from the site and which may be unaffected by the proposal. However, the most obvious visual impact would be from Appledore Avenue and the cul-de-sacs leading off it. The appeal site slopes upwards from the residential development on these side streets and provides an attractive vista of woodland from these roads.
 12. Large areas of scrub and several mature trees would be removed in order to make way for the nine houses, their gardens, drives and the new road. In addition, the large houses would be elevated above the existing adjacent development which would make them prominent in the street-scene, especially in views along Edenbridge Close towards its turning head where the vista would be changed from a mature green bank to a hard surfaced entrance point to the new road with two large elevated houses at the end of the cul-de-sac. Moreover, due to the raised level of the land, the dwellings would also be visible from the other cul-de-sacs, including from multiple gardens and Appledore Avenue itself.
 13. Whilst I recognise that the houses would be spaced far apart from each other and that there would be significant amounts of new planting including new trees, the planting would take time to mature and it is likely that the development would be seen through the new trees in the winter months. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the new and remaining trees would survive long term, especially those in private gardens as these could be removed or heavily pruned by the occupants. In any event, the tree planting cannot overcome the physical loss of the natural landscape and its replacement by a developed area.
 14. The two houses in the BBC area would be screened on two sides by existing development and would be less visible in the wider landscape. However, they would encroach the built form of Sandy Lane onto area that is currently natural open space. It is proposed that they would also be screened by trees where they adjoin the existing open space beyond the appeal site. However, as in the case of the NCC houses, the trees would take time to mature and would be under the control of future occupants.
 15. In summary, the houses on the ridge would be intrusive in the street-scene and both areas of housing would encroach into the wooded area which would diminish the visual quality of the local natural landscape at the edge of the built-up area.

16. I therefore conclude that the proposed dwellings would severely harm the character and appearance of the area.
17. The proposal is therefore contrary to ACS Policy 10 of the ACS and LAPP Policies DE1 and DE2 which seek to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Living Conditions

Existing nearby occupiers

18. The development that would occur in the NCC area would adjoin the southern boundaries of numerous houses at the tops of the cul-de-sacs off Appledore Avenue. Most of these boundaries are rear boundaries enclosing the main private amenity space of the dwellings. There would be a dense bank of trees planted along these boundaries in order to provide screening to the proposed dwellings.
19. I heard from the appellant at the Inquiry that they would not necessarily be particularly tall trees. However, most trees grow significantly taller than a boundary fence, which is what many of the existing residents have on their boundaries. The proposed trees to be planted along the neighbouring boundaries would result in overshadowing to the gardens of these properties and to habitable rooms with rear facing windows. Furthermore, the trees would be so close to the boundary that they would overhang the adjoining gardens. Trees create debris from leaves and branches and such a dense row of them would result in significant leaf, twig and bird droppings into these gardens which would be a nuisance to the adjoining residents.
20. In addition, the houses would be built on land which is at a significantly higher level than the houses and gardens at the heads of the cul-de-sac. They would appear as dominant features and would result in a poor outlook from both gardens and habitable room windows of many of the existing dwellings backing onto them.

Future occupiers

21. The proposed dwellings in the NCC area would be surrounded by both existing mature trees and new trees which would be very close to the houses. This would make the dwellings overshadowed and their occupants would not enjoy sufficient natural daylight or sunlight either inside their houses or within their gardens.
22. The proposed dwellings would be spaced wide apart along a long drive. The amount of existing trees together with the proposed trees would hinder natural surveillance of the appeal site, in particular the residual open spaces between the proposed dwellings. These spaces could not be adequately overlooked by the houses and would be vulnerable to unwanted activity.
23. In respect of waste collection, the Council says that as a result of an emerging Waste Policy Framework, developers are being advised that the Council is only likely to collect the waste from the adopted highway. However, from what I heard at the round table session it is likely that the access road would be a private drive which would mean that residents would have to take their bins to Edenbridge Court to be collected by the Council. Some of the dwellings, especially those on Plots 1 and 2, would be located a significant distance from

the shared vehicular access to the public highway. Wheeling bins over a long distance would be inconvenient and particularly difficult for people with mobility problems. The appellant explained that a private company could come onto the site to collect waste from individual dwellings but I have no firm details of how this would work or be controlled in the future.

24. In respect of community cohesion, I note the Council's concerns about the drive being long and the dwellings being far apart. However, the site is at the edge of a built-up area where future residents could mix with other people within that wider urban environment. Even in rural areas, there can be strong communities and I do not consider that a long drive and large plots would necessarily prevent community cohesion.
25. The Council has also expressed concern in respect of access for pedestrians, visitors and deliveries. The houses at Plots 1 and 2 would be just under one kilometre from local shops and bus stops but other plots would be somewhat closer. As there are pavements and street lighting on the public roads, I consider this to be a reasonable walking distance. I have no substantive evidence that there would be difficulties for delivery drivers accessing the site.
26. Although I have found no harm to community cohesion and that future occupiers would have pedestrian access to day to day services, overall, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of adjoining residents and it would not provide acceptable living conditions for future residents. It would therefore be contrary to ACS Policy 10 and Policies DE1 and DE2 of the LAPP. In combination these policies seek to protect the living conditions of residents; avoid residual space; and promote safe living environments.

Nature Conservation (local wildlife site, habitats and biodiversity)

27. The site is defined as a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) under the LAPP; and a Green Infrastructure Asset (GIA) and a Biodiversity Asset under the BLP. There is a significant coverage of Japanese Knotweed (JKW) on the site. There is dispute between the parties as to the extent of the coverage but I was able to see at my visit that the JKW does not dominate the site. Although part of the site is a monoculture of JKW, there are other parts where it is mixed with other species and there are areas where it is not present.
28. The appellant submitted a calculation based on Natural England's Biodiversity Metric v2.0. Since the Inquiry, Natural England has published v3.0 and the main parties were written to for their comments. The appellant's calculation based on v2.0 showed a biodiversity net gain of about 8%. Their calculation based on the new v3.0 shows a biodiversity net gain of around 21%.
29. However, the evidence presented at the Inquiry, including the debate over the extent of the JKW, raised serious doubts over how realistic a calculation could be, based on the submitted plans. For example, over 1000 trees are proposed to be planted but the appellant's arboricultural witness admitted that there would not be enough room for all of them to survive, giving a survival to maturity rate of 20-50% and this lack of space for the trees and poor survival was not accounted for by the appellant's ecologist. In addition, some habitats would not thrive because they would be under tree canopies.

30. Although I appreciate that the Metric scores attributable to bracken and bramble have been fixed and cannot be subjective, the Council's response to the revised Metric is that the calculation under the new Metric requires detail of factors not required to be considered under Metric 2.0 which have not been submitted. Also, that the submitted mapping is too generalised to undertake the calculation.
31. The appellant proposes permanent removal of JKW by excavation and extraction which would cost around £500,000. As the proceeds arising from the sale of the proposed dwellings would fund this, the appellant argued that the JKW would continue to spread if the development did not go ahead. They say that it will spread throughout the site quickly which would result in it becoming the dominant species at the expense of the existing mosaic of woodland species. They also argued that the JKW would spread to the Sandy Lane Nature Reserve.
32. The appellant's ecologist provided a "Future Spread Map" which predicts the spread of JKW over five, ten and fifteen years if left untreated and it shows it spreading into neighbouring gardens. Nevertheless, it shows that even after fifteen years, much of the site would still remain as a mosaic of species rather than being covered by the JKW. The adjacent Sandy Lane Nature Reserve is managed by Broxtowe Borough Council which has already spot treated small patches of JKW and I have no reason to doubt that this would continue.
33. I also heard from neighbours at the Inquiry that the JKW had already spread into their gardens but I saw no evidence of this at my visits to the gardens of interested parties who had asked me to view the site from their properties. I have no evidence that other methods of control of the JKW beyond the site have been properly explored by the parties concerned.
34. There is no doubt that control of JKW would be beneficial to the site. However, I heard at the Inquiry that the proposed excavation process would result in other plants, such as mature trees being removed as well. Therefore, there is some ecological cost to its removal purely by the extraction method. I have no doubt that the JKW will spread further if left untreated, particularly if members of the public continue to use the site, as it can be spread by getting attached to people's clothing and shoes. However, JKW can be treated by chemical means or a mixture of extraction and chemical, albeit, this would be a long-term project to control its growth and spread, rather than to eradicate it completely. I acknowledge that chemical treatment by way of spraying could damage other plants amongst the JKW but it is also possible to inject it into the stems of the JKW or to use precision when spraying. However, digging would be an instant obliteration of other plants, including the mature trees.
35. Furthermore, from what I heard at the Inquiry, there is no evidence that the landowner has not sought to prevent the spread of the JKW since 2018 when the land was purchased. The appellant could, at least, have put a fence around the part of the site that is most affected by the JKW. Although I note the appellant's comments at the Inquiry, that fences would be vandalised or removed by members of the public, I heard no evidence that this has been tested in respect of the JKW and I am unconvinced that some bio-security could not be implemented to help stop the spread.
36. The development would provide mitigation in terms of some replacement ecological features but the long established and more natural mosaic of habitat

cannot be replicated in a domestic environment. In particular, there would be a loss of habitat for bats and although bat boxes could be quickly provided, they only give an opportunity for roosting rather than foraging. Furthermore, once the natural habitat has been destroyed in order to develop the site, it would take some time for the replacement habitats to develop and there is no guarantee that they would be retained and maintained properly by future occupants of the houses. In addition, activity around the houses, especially on the new access road, would not encourage the establishment of replacement wildlife.

37. I also heard at the Inquiry that the trees to be retained around the housing would require work such as crown lifting and I could see at my visit that this would be the case. Furthermore, residents would be tempted to severely prune or remove them due to their overshadowing effects. Overall, the proposals for tree retention are unlikely to be completely successful.
38. For all these reasons I give both the original and the revised biometric calculations limited weight due to the anomalies contained within and therefore, I am not convinced that there would be a biodiversity net gain.
39. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal decision at Bramcote Golf Course¹. However, each site has different characteristics and in that case the Council did not raise a biodiversity objection to the proposal. Therefore, that appeal decision is not comparable to the proposal before me.
40. I therefore conclude that the proposal would pose a threat to nature conservation, the local wildlife site, ecology and biodiversity. The proposal conflicts with Policy 17 of the ACS; Policy EN6 of the LAPP; and Policy 31 of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan (2019). In combination, these policies seek to protect and increase biodiversity. It would also conflict with Section 15 of the Framework which says that planning decisions should minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity.

Green Infrastructure Asset and Open Space Network

41. The site is part of NCC's Open Space Network (OSN) under the LAPP. It is also a Green Infrastructure Asset (GIA) and a Prominent Area for Special Protection (PASP) under the BLP.
42. Policy 16 of the ALS seeks to protect and enhance Green Infrastructure Assets. It indicates that open space should be protected from development but exceptions may be made if the development is a small part of the Green Infrastructure, not detrimental to its function, or if neither of those apply, the open space is shown to be underused or undervalued. It indicates that where new development has an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure assets, alternative scheme designs that have no or little impact should be considered before mitigation is provided and that the need for and benefit of the development will be weighed against the harm.
43. The justification for Policy 16 of the ALS says that open spaces are an important part of the Green Infrastructure network, especially within urban areas. It explains that there are some areas of open space that can be threatening to use or are undervalued by the local community. Where these sites are identified as surplus to requirements through Open Space

¹ APP/J3015/W/16/3162096

Assessments or local studies, redevelopment can help to address these issues, for instance through appropriate design to allow overlooking. It also says that redevelopment or partial redevelopment might be the most practical option, provided the loss can be replaced by equivalent or better provision in a suitable location.

44. BLP Policy 28 indicates that permission will not be granted for development that results in any harm or loss to the GIA unless the benefits of development are clearly shown to outweigh the harm. It also explains that Prominent Areas for Special Protection are hills and ridges comprising prominent areas of attractive landscape which provide distinct and permanent landmarks near the edge of the Greater Nottingham conurbation.
45. LAPP Policy EN1 indicates that development affecting the Open Space Network will be refused unless a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space to be surplus to requirements; or b) the development will enhance or increase the area of the OSN, particularly in areas requiring improvement, and help to achieve the City Council's aims for the Network or c) the development is for other types of sports or recreational provision or ancillary development associated with the Open Space, and the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss. However, in all cases, the development should not have a detrimental effect on the open space, environmental, landscape character or wildlife value of the Network as a whole. The justification to the policy explains that open spaces, even without public access, can fulfil an important role in terms of enhancing biodiversity, connectivity and the visual character of the City. It acknowledges that some areas of open space suffer from a range of problems including poor access, vandalism and antisocial behaviour, lack of maintenance and inappropriate location.
46. The site is private land and public access could be prevented in the future and benefits of the scheme would include securing public access; provide public liability insurance which currently does not exist; and the management of the area in the long term. Nevertheless, even if public access was prevented, the open space can be viewed and enjoyed from adjacent public footpaths and a bridleway so it would retain a significant value regardless of the public access. The ridge is an area of attractive landscape which provides a distinct landmark near the edge of the built-up areas of Broxtowe and Nottingham and I noted at my visit that it can be seen in numerous long-range views within the locality. Not only does it add to the visual character of the area, it also fulfils an important role in terms of biodiversity. Therefore, it has public value whether or not it is publicly accessible.
47. About 30% of the site would be taken up with the proposed residential development leaving the rest of it as public woodland. This loss would not be replaced and would be detrimental to the function of the woodland and the natural landscape it provides for the area.
48. I acknowledge that the proposal includes a range of physical additions which the appellant claims would enhance public access to nature. These would include paths which the appellant says would be more accessible for people with disabilities although I have no firm details of how inclusive these paths would be. The appellant also says that the site would provide attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks but cycling and walking within the

site is already possible and I have no firm details to show how cycling would be made easier given that the site is not level.

49. Whilst these features might be attractive for users of the remaining open space, their benefits must be balanced against the quantum of space to be lost. I am also mindful that there is already a formal play area adjacent to the site which I saw at my visit. This was well maintained and being used at the time I viewed it and I have no reason to believe that there is a lack of play areas in the locality. Moreover, a woodland in its natural state provides play opportunities.
50. Whilst the appellant has argued that there has been some anti-social behaviour and vandalism on the site, particularly in the form of fences being broken down, I do not have substantive evidence that the site is threatening to use, or undervalued by the local community. In any event, the housing would be surrounded by woodland which would provide little opportunity for natural surveillance of the remaining open space so it is unlikely to prevent further anti-social acts. Furthermore, the site has not been identified as surplus to requirements through Open Space Assessments or local studies.
51. Whilst some improvements would be made to the quality of the remaining open space in terms of the physical items that would be installed, I do not consider that the benefits would clearly outweigh the quantitative loss of the open space.
52. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the OSN, the GAI and the PASP and would conflict with Policy 16 of the ALS; BLP Policy 28; and LAPP Policy EN1 which seek to protect such spaces.

Other Matters

53. The main parties have submitted S.106 agreements to cover both Council's administrative areas and the appellant has also submitted unilateral undertakings in respect of matters that could not be agreed with the Councils under the S.106 agreements. Collectively, these undertakings make several provisions. Some are to make the development acceptable and others can be considered benefits of the scheme.
54. I consider the benefits of the scheme would be contributions to affordable housing and employment and training provisions. However, these benefits would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
55. The Unilateral undertakings would allow the football pitch to be used in perpetuity as recreation land and to include in any transfer of the site, a covenant binding the transferee to the said undertaking. Currently, a small part of the pitch is within the appellant's ownership. However, the Council is satisfied that the pitch is adequate the way it already is. The appellant has also allowed for the provision of a laid out public right of way across the site. At the Inquiry the Council expressed concerns that this footpath would not be subject of natural surveillance. Even if I were to consider either of these undertakings to be a benefit and complied with the CIL Regulations, neither or both would outweigh the harm I have identified.
56. The remainder of the provisions in the S.106 agreements pertain to make the development acceptable. However, it is not necessary for me to look at them in detail, given that I have found the proposal is unacceptable for other reasons.

57. In respect of housing land supply, from 16 June 2021, a 35% uplift to the Standard Method for calculating housing need is applied for those urban local authorities in the top 20 cities and urban centres list, of which Nottingham is one.² At the time of the Inquiry the Councils could demonstrate an up-to-date housing land supply. Even if the uplift has made the housing supply 35% deficient, the benefit of providing the additional homes to the supply of housing would not outweigh the harm I have identified. Similarly, the addition of large, detached homes to the housing mix does not outweigh the harm.
58. Several appeal decisions, local planning decisions and a development plan allocation have been put before me by the appellant to support their case, in particular several cases in the nearby locality were discussed at the Inquiry³. However, in each of these cases, there were material differences between them and the appeal before me, such as the scale and nature of development. They were also on different sites with different characteristics. None of them were directly comparable with the case before me and I have considered this proposal on its own particular merits.

Conclusion

59. Whilst there would be some benefits of the scheme, including the removal of JKW, I do not consider that the proposed housing can justify the enabling of any or all of these benefits due to the overall harm that would arise. The balance of the harm against the benefits is stark and the harm I have found to living conditions alone outweighs the benefits even without adding the other harm I have found. I have considered all other material considerations, including the letters of support from interested parties, but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached.
60. The proposal conflicts with the development plans as a whole. Even if paragraph 11(d) of the Framework were engaged, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
61. Appeals A and B are therefore dismissed.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR

² Written Ministerial Statement, MHCLG, 16 December 2020 and Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 2a-005-20190220

³ Listed under paragraph 27 of the appellant's Supplementary Proof of Evidence (Planning).

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

Appellant

A1 Greater Nottingham Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy Part 1 July 2020

A2 Comparison of S.106 agreements and unilateral undertaking

A3 Extract and Copy from register of HM Land Registry for Title No NT282310

A4 Letter from Ashworths Solicitors LLP to The Planning Inspectorate dated 15 June 2021

Councils

C1 Update on conditions

C2 Additional conditions

C3 Tracked changes conditions

C4 Plans omitted from conditions

C5 S.106 Issues Position of LPAs as at 14.6.2021

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE INQUIRY

S.106 agreements – One between the appellant and NCC and one between the appellant and BCC.

Unilateral Undertakings from the appellant - one to NCC and one to BCC.

APPEARANCES

For the Councils

Thea Osmond Smith of Counsel
She called:

Emily Aron BSc(Hons) MRes CIEEM – Biodiversity and Green Space Officer NCC
Ben Driver BSc CIEEM – Conservation Officer Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
Jenny Curry BA(Hons) PDip MRTPI – Senior Principal Planning Officer NCC
Susan Heron MRTPI – Senior Principal Planning Officer BCC

For the Appellant

William Webster of Counsel
He called:

Oliver Ramm BSc(hons)MCIEEM – Director, RammSanderson Ecology
Rebecca Peace HNC – Rebecca Peace Arboriculture
Matthew Day – Regional Director, Environet UK Ltd
Richard Kirkby FFA, FFTA, ATT – Richard Kirkby Ltd
Kevin Bannister MSc(Law), BSc(Hons), GradDip(Law), MCIARB, FCIQB, FICCP, MAPM, IMAPS, Grad(IOSH), Dip(NEBOSH) ENvDip(NEBOSH) – TFM Consulting (UK) Ltd

Geoffrey Prince MRTPI – Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd

Interested Parties

Councillor Steve Carr, Beeston North, BBC
Councillor David Watts, Bramcote, BBC
Councillor Cate Woodward, Wollaton West, NCC
Claudia Gathercole – local resident
Tom Huggan – local resident
Sebastian Bonicel – local resident
Elizabeth Dalton – local resident
Ellie Winfield – local resident
Zhang Yingying – local resident
Sam Bignall – local resident
Daniel Mier – local resident
Kelly Richardson – local resident
Moneesh Patel – local resident
David Mann – local resident
Chris Paul – local resident
Mel Siew – local resident
Penny Williams – local resident