

The Park Estate Conservation Area

Community Consultation Event 17th July 2019

Summary of Results

Project Reference: 19-029

On behalf of Nottingham Park Conservation Trust

August 2019



WWW.LOCUSCONSULTING.CO.UK

1 INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of a community consultation event, which was undertaken in support of the reappraisal of The Park Conservation Area, Nottingham. This report fulfils task 2.6 and contributes to task 5.8 of the project schedule, as outlined in the project design submitted to Nottingham Park Conservation Trust.

The event was undertaken across the evening of Wednesday 17th July at The Park Tennis Club clubhouse. Approximately forty community members and local stakeholders attended, including representatives of Nottingham City Council. The event was led by staff from Locus Consulting in partnership with representatives from Nottingham Park Conservation Trust.

The consultation process included introductory presentations, followed by discussions centred on four questions of relevance to the conservation area's management. Attendees were arranged into groups to facilitate round-table discussion. The groups were provided with a sequence of consultation questions relating to the positive and negative aspects of the conservation area, and issues and opportunities for its future management. Discussion was facilitated by the delivery team, with attendees encouraged to write down their comments (anonymous, via Post-It notes). In total, nearly three-hundred individual comments were received, which are provided in full in the report Appendix.

Time was allocated at the end for open discussion and Q&A.

This report summarises the results of the consultation.

2 SUMMARY OF CONSULTEE RESPONSES

NB. The following section discusses the responses to consultation questions, as provided by consultees. Whilst all comments are summarised here, it is noted that a number of the issues and aspirations highlighted are beyond the scope of the potential controls that may be established through a conservation area management plan or existing heritage planning frameworks.

Question 1: What are the most defining features of The Park for you?

- The large majority of responses focussed on the elements of the area's historic character, with particular emphasis on local architecture, trees, green and open spaces, morphology (layout of roads, plots, and gardens), street furniture (particularly gas lamps), and others.
- There was consistent appreciation for the ambience and experience of the area, with particular emphasis on the clean air, low traffic activity and noise, walkability, low-level lighting (both seen as a positive and negative), and absence of cluttered streets. The area was, on several occasions, described as an "oasis" within the heart of Nottingham, in close proximity to the centre but highly distinctive in myriad ways.
- Some described negative features, with note of poor-quality modern development, on-street parking (both seen as too much and too little provision available), and some concern about noise at particular times of day and night.

Question 2: What positive and/negative changes have occurred to the area's character in recent decades?

Positive

- Many responded favourably in respect of increased levels of investment into the traditional estate houses, resulting in their restoration. Examples of houses converted back into single-occupier residential use were highlighted particularly favourably.
- The restoration of local heritage assets was celebrated by numerous consultees, with specific references to the pavilion, the war memorial, the park steps, and the tea rooms.
- Comments praised the management of the estate by Nottingham Park Estate Ltd. noting a general improvement in the condition and maintenance of features including green spaces, street furniture, road and pavement surfacing, and trees.

Negative

- Increased car ownership and the resulting increase of on-road parking was seen as a negative factor by many. The conversion of many garages to residential was also highlighted by some as being part of the problem.
- Over-intensive and poor-quality new development, of both small and large scale, was identified by multiple consultees. Several raised concerns over a lack of planning enforcement in the area, and a resulting level of incremental change which has steadily and detrimentally eroded positive local characteristics.
- Amongst the most regular comments related to the sub-division of original estate houses, particularly for use as HMOs and short-term holiday letting. The resulting loss of original features, both interior and exterior, was identified by some as an ongoing concern.
- There were a number of comments regarding the poor management of trees within private gardens, and the overall steady drop in the perceived quality and maintenance of landscaping in some private spaces.
- Regular comments concerning elements potentially outside the immediate remit of heritage management were made, including increased through traffic, noise levels, and numbers of students.

Question 3: What type of future developments should be subject to greater planning controls or incentives?

- There was a common desire for a reduction in the existing and potential future impact of on-street parking. Many raised concerns about the conversion of garages to residential use. Schemes to encourage off road parking were highlighted as desirable.
- There was widespread aspiration to improve the quality of modern development within the conservation area, from small scale changes (e.g. replacement of windows) through to larger works (e.g. extensions and new build). There were contrasting opinions as to whether new development should be modern in aesthetic or attempt to closely align to the traditional characteristics of the estate. Many agreed that quality of materials and a locally responsive design rationale were key. The potential benefit of design guidance for the Park was suggested by several consultees.
- Adaptions for environmental agenda received considerable attention, particularly surrounding provision of electric car charging facilities, adapting buildings for modern standards (insulation), solar panels, and recycling facilities (both private and public). There were mixed views as to whether these should be incentivised or controlled, with a roughly even split across those making comment.
- Numerous consultees expressed a desire to see greater controls on small-scale changes that were detrimentally impacting the traditional fabric of the area. Particularly, that which is occurring through permitted development rights. Change to windows and doors were a regular focal point. Article 4 Directions were mentioned by a select few as a potential mechanism for increased control.
- Several consultees expressed a desire to see an overall improvement of the 20th century architecture within the Park, specifically efforts to restore areas of degradation, and to rectify historical mistakes – either through their original design or from later modification.
- Better management of trees and open spaces was raised frequently, with frequent reference to those located within private gardens, which were seen by many to be suffering from poor (or lack of) management.
- Several consultees identified a desire to see greater control on the sub-division of large houses into multiple-units, and changes use from residential to short-term letting arrangements.

Question 4: Any other comments?

- Additional comments were varied, from concerns around the effectiveness of existing heritage management and planning frameworks, to detailed comments on specific elements of the Park's built form. Comments are provided in full within the following section.

3 COMMENTS IN FULL

NB. All responses have been transcribed in full and verbatim. Results are listed in no particular order.

Question 1: What are the most defining features of The Park for you?

- Street trees, gas lamps, road layout, The Bowl - must be protected at all costs
- Interesting architectural details, views, green areas, gas lights
- Trees and clean air
- Low levels of traffic
- Horrible developments jammed into front. Gardens e.g. 5, 9, 11. Pelham Crescent. Ruining the original frontages
- No road signs
- No telephone boxes
- Central city. Cleaner air. No bus routes through Park - but on either side. Attenuated lighting. Green areas (the circuses) for flat dwellers. Neighbouring schools.
- Wildlife
- The geography of the Park and the relationships this has created at the edge of the bowl
- Planting schemes and railings
- Sublets and inadequate parking - parking 'hotspots'
- Views of castle
- The appearance of the original buildings - their external features including stained glass etc. The large gardens that go with some of the above [original buildings]
- The number of established trees and the green areas and open spaces. The gas lights (and their numbering to facilitate dead bulbs)
- The details of different buildings e.g. banding - sculpture - brick detailing - window design - stained glass and so on
- History and architecture
- Unity of materials e.g. slate roofs - now being destroyed by rooflights (permitted development). Recent improvement by the NPCT
- Improvements include railings - plants on circuses. The steps. The tunnel. The new park by the Park Office.
- Balance of buildings and trees
- Green spaces, trees, circuses etc.
- Sense of community
- Trees. Detached houses. Wildlife. Green areas.
- It used to be peace and quiet. Less true now - unfortunately.
- The bowl, road layout, caves, secret tunnels
- The circuses. Green places.
- Tunnel
- [Park Valley House] scaffolding - 20 years and counting. No ugly road signs
- Trees - both in streets and gardens
- 1960's developments
- No shops

- The circuses, trees, red Victorian properties, brick walls, gas lights, proximity to centre, blue lines, tennis
- The variety of pedestrian access ways
- Park bowl
- Tennis clubs
- Views from and of high places
- Closeness to city and fantastic public transport (at least at the northern end)
- Park bowl and wider contours - architecture - green space- circuses, trees etc. - road layout - gaslight street lighting
- Wide roads and narrow roads
- 1. Street tree planting 2. The circuses 3. The Bowl - the recreation area and pavilion 4. The edge and skyline 5. The walls
- Well constructed and maintained properties, except near Castle Blvd.
- Controlled entrances limiting the through traffic
- Walled large gardens
- Victorian houses - gas lamps - green spaces - original layout - no electricity pylons
- Nobody can afford it anymore. In Victorian times there were 4 gardeners for the large garden. Nobody could afford it now, so the heritage gardens are inevitably lost
- No buses
- Access to city (centre)
- Owner occupiers - maintain state of buildings. Rentals obvious. Privacy. Threatening miscreants on Leton Road at night. Trees - benefit and menace.
- Use of Bulwell stone (though I am not a fan of it) - subdued lighting
- Gated entrances
- Green space, trees, absence of traffic (quiet), 'old' brickwork and detail on houses, feel of being in a village
- Views from bowl up slope. Skyline important.
- Open spaces and trees
- Sense of uniqueness created by all the Victorian developments (arcadian, street layout, gas lighting etc., original estate houses) - outstanding conservation area 1975
- Gaslights
- Old houses - original and some later good developments
- Gaslights
- Range Rovers (too many of them!)
- Street names - gates to the estate
- An oasis from the rough and tumble of an urban city
- Nurses memorial
- Fine brickworks on walls chimneys etc. Large gardens with large houses. Wide roads. Preserved features of gas lamps/signs/railings. Quite peaceful neighbourhood - you can hear the birds! Stained glass windows. Georgian/Victorian architecture.
- Boundaries - Bulwell stone - brick walls with detailing - railings
- The open bowl and preventing the bowl from being built upon
- Original walls with local stone
- A 'secret' tunnel entrance - boundary walls lining broad streets

- Gas lighting
- Mix of traditional (heritage) and some fairly bad modern developments which can not be eliminated, or turned into pastiche of the heritage housing.
- The old architecture
- Original Victorian estate houses
- Density of development - prop. of large estate houses to gardens
- Garden walls
- Use of traditional materials and styles e.g. timber sash windows, brick banding, use of brick/slate, pitched roofs - lack of rooflights
- Original estate houses
- Circuses and open spaces
- Mixture of residential with social activity such as tennis, bowls and squash
- Gas lighting. Trees although many in need of trimming
- Quietness except at night when the students are walking through to Lenton
- Architecture. The tunnels and history of the area.
- Street layout and connections to wider area - e.g. tunnel - gas lighting on streets
- Trees and open spaces - circuses and bowl, gardens of houses, bowls club on Duke William Mount
- Victorian architecture not spoilt by inappropriate extremes
- Gas lighting but needs to be improved
- Gas/low light levels, green space, large houses with large gardens, 'Victorian character'
- Some quality 'modern' homes like at Lincoln Circus (the alteration of which would be damaging to the amenity)
- Mature trees and wildlife
- Central location
- Pedestrian environment
- Trees
- Low density of housing
- 2x circus
- Gardens/trees in streets
- Quiet living environment
- 1. Characterful Victorian buildings 2. plenty of trees and gardens 3. Closeness to city centre 4. Great variety of residents
- Parking on road - negative
- 1. Historic planned streets 2. Well designed houses in a large plot

Question 2: What positive and/or negative changes have occurred to the area's character in recent decades?

Positive

- Good a) restoration of the pavilion b) cleaning and restoration of the war memorial
- Positive: large houses restored or single dwelling from private apartments
- Positive: The trees have been looked after
- Positive: Many houses have been refurbished where previously run down
- Positive: Better maintenance of roads, trees and open spaces
- Positive encouragement to restore from HMO to family home
- More involvement of the local community
- This pavilion!
- Restoration of older houses that are being returned to family dwelling
- Improvement of older houses by younger occupants
- Beginning to refuse permission for developments in gardens. Clamp down on HMOs.
- Roads in much better condition and lamps. Greater control of street parking. Conversions have more attention to detail. Planting of circuses.
- Improving houses but not using car parking spaces
- Greater community spirit - NPRA/NPEL meetings - talks - U3A (failed attempt at coffee shop)
- Positive management of Park by NPEL over decades
- HMO to single dwelling
- Park steps and other green (-ish) areas much improved
- Improvement - Greater attention to building appearances, more lawn areas - houses open
- Derelict garages and coach houses being turned into houses that are sympathetic to the streetscape i.e. don't dominate or look out of character
- Big improvement in open green spaces and wildflower planting
- Improvements carried out by NPEL and NPCT. Improved management, street cleaning, dog bins, lighting maintained and retained.
- Some owners have cared for and improved their historic environment
- More houses have CCTV
- Infilling has provided opportunity for down sizing and remaining in the Park
- Friendly atmosphere among residents. Some conversion back from bedsits of 70s
- Renovation and bringing into use of run down buildings. Restoration and enhancement of green spaces (but others are underused and at risk).
- NPEL a great improvement on Oxford Uni

- Recent (last decade) significant investment in many properties has been a huge positive
- Good work on green spaces, traffic control
- It's better since 1984! i.e. quieter and better maintained
- Pavilions beautifully renovated
- Railings, circus maintenance, kerbs
- The tea room - beautiful renovated
- Large investment by residents to improve their properties. Very few run down buildings. Residents who care for the gardens and properties.
- New materials being used to enhance old properties
- Some mediocre buildings have been improved.
- New surfaces, old circuses.

Negative

- Increase in through traffic which ignores 1 way streets e.g. Tatteshall Drive (top)
- Road obstruction by building subcontractors' vehicles. Student noise late at night.
- Over building on later 60s/70s housing to create over large unsympathetic 'contemporary' development which is over dominating the street scene and the character and appearance of the C.A
- More students
- More cars parked on the roads
- Granting of retrospective planning when clear abuse knowing that by undertaking work on building highly likely as with Waltons Hotel, planning will be granted.
- Over intensive development caused by modern development pressures leading to breakdown of character and appearance
- Negative impacts of sub division of original estate house gardens for modern infill development at high density i.e. loss of identity of original house to garden ratio.
- Increased car ownership where properties do not have adjacent parking.
- Vast increase in the number of cars. Too much increase in the number of separate dwellings - houses converted to flats etc.
- Negative impacts of subdivision of original estate houses to flats at high density involving loss of original features, loss of gardens for parking, installation of large modern rooflights
- Too much development. Increased light pollution. On street parking as garages not big enough or no longer used for cars (does not help with car crime)
- Horrible developments in front yards/gardens destroying original frontages
- Subdivision of original houses and plots
- Inappropriate development allowed to the character of houses - rooflights
- Street parking - petty crime - walk through by non residents - poorer pavements
- Loss of family houses

- Work undertaken without planning - development of cellars for additional residential accommodation
- More owners rely on on-street parking
- Houses converted to flats causing loss of gardens to car parks and rainwater fall off
- HMOs causing noise and disturbance very inappropriate in the area
- Emerging problem of 'airbnb' type transience rentals
- Access and traffic increase 1. Derby Road access - depends on pedestrian crossing, traffic lights. 2. Closed Maid Marian Way access
- Subdivided houses not good for families, which often means resident mix not balanced (esp. e.g. Hope Drive, Hamilton Drive along southern edge of Park)
- More clusters of HMOs on the peripheries - Barrack Lane, Hope Drive
- Adverse change - opening of Lenton Road access at night, greater on street parking
- HMO use has increased, mainly near to Castle Boulevard
- Airbnb type ultra short term letting are a problem
- Changes at Walton's hotel - negative
- Some infilling is dreadful - Spinrock for example. Tattershall Drive ignoring of one way sign. Half of Barrack Lane that is part of the Park is totally ignored.
- Loss of significant trees from gardens
- Conversion of garages into bedrooms is a negative
- In some areas, too many cars parking e.g. Lenton Avenue
- Some out of context developments and fashionable architecture unrelated to the ethos of the Park. Noise increase. Parking increase.
- Some large inappropriate developments e.g. Cedar Lodge, St Helier
- Too much tree felling
- Relations with council are more distant
- Move to HMOs/absentee landlordism (associated with problems like noise, anti social behaviour)
- Trees need managing better, too big
- Infill development in former coach house gardens on Lenton Avenue
- The gardens are a shadow of their former selves, as no one can afford the gardeners required to keep them up
- Intensive development puts great pressure on car parking on streets - now some dangerous roads
- NOISE - Walton's Hotel is now a student bar with outside terrace playing music. Taxis in/out North Road to hotel, turning round, calling for clients until disturbing neighbours. Noisy people leaving hotel bar - also at 1.30 am.
- Poor planning enforcement (e.g. Waltons Hotel)
- Significant transience, leading to neglect and lack of interest
- uPVC windows of poor quality. Brickwork that doesn't match existing 'traditional' brick. Infill - gardens being built on when there was no previous building (e.g. stables). Loss of green space.
- Population density has increased significantly
- Nothing positive

- Pavement parking - looks crap, damages kerbs
- Planners - in 1972 my house, with a double garage, had to have off road parking for 2 cars - city planners dropped this requirement in the 80s
- Car ownership increase. Intensification.
- More garage conversions leading to on street parking
- Businesses being run from homes and airbnb
- Properties not using their garage for cars - but freezers etc. and then parking on the road - individuals owning 2 cars each
- Too much through traffic
- HMOs, airbnb, transience, maintenance of properties
- 22 Lenton Avenue - 2 storey semi changed to 3 storey and makes former twin semi look odd, built garage in the entire garden
- Hideous fire escapes added to permit adaption to flats with no design benefit at all
- Too many HMOs
- More underground additions to estate houses
- House next to 5 Pelham Cres. built about 20 years ago - intrusive
- Many old garages are being left to degenerate. They are too small for a car, what should be done with them.
- Not enough of the mediocre housing stock has been enhanced/demolished

Question 3: What type of future developments should be subject to greater planning controls or incentives?

- Give more planning to lines of old decaying garages
- Encourage properties to be built with outstanding architectural merit. Replacing mediocre properties.
- Preserving features of old houses, while allowing them to be more insulated
- Protection for gas lighting (and prevention of 'drowning out' by electric lights)
- Ensure provision of electric car charging
- Positive support for trees but some trees particularly forest trees in private gardens are too big having matured. Some trees in gardens should be TPOs.
- Electric car chargers in roads - fewer?
- More trees in areas/streets when trees not present now
- Development control officers do not really understand their C.A. policies in place - existing policies should be simplified and strengthened
- Incentives - e.g. materials, high quality changes to all buildings inc. 20th century
- Virgin and BT above ground box
- Fewer restrictions on use of plastic for windows and doors in damp or wet areas of a building
- Encouraging more interest and provision to encourage wildlife
- Makeovers' of 70s properties - render!
- Are we asking for noose, tightening around our necks? Park and Council controls?
- Greater control over UPVC windows
- There should be a temporary moratorium on 'new' build in the Park until new plan adopted e.g. overbuilds, demolitions, subdivision of garden plots
- Encourage of original architectural features
- Encourage conversion of modern 2 storey houses into 3 storey. Encourage recladding of modern houses. Has to be something I like though.
- Design guidance produced for development guidance (see other LPAs use of these in a positive way)
- Greater restrictions: HMOS, Airbnb, uPVC windows, removal of boundary walls, loss of green/gardens, block paving, rendering/updating
- Renewable energy - solar panels?? No wind turbines. Protection of existing green areas - circuses, parks, Park bowl area.
- Drainpipes and windows - cabling, large houses and masses of it
- Subdivision of existing houses. Conversion of garages into extra bedrooms. Permitted DRs on windows, chimneys. Extra parking places in gardens.
- FEWER restrictions on sympathetic renewable energy solutions
- Encourage the recycling/re-use of traditional materials again rather than modern cladding/roof tiles/APC etc.
- Positive nature of conservation to enhance environment and local

economy communicated to people not interested in conservation per se but a post code address

- Do we need greater controls? Incentives - money? Whose? Want to promote architectural excellence and innovation or maintain Victorian stereotype
- Trees. Height - roofs. Parking controls.
- Modern new builds to reflect historic nature of the area - less ultra modern
- Places for kids to play
- Any changes to fenestration, boundaries, rooflines etc. should require permission
- More control over new design needed - poor quality modern development needs to be discouraged via possibly: design guidance, education of residents to the qualities of area
- Fewer restrictions - reinstatement of original designs/materials - reinstatement of green space
- Tree felling - need much stricter controls
- Must have parking which does not affect neighbours
- Garages being converted into living space (more cars on streets)
- Greater control over loss of garages - stop conversions to bedrooms
- Should not alter the traditional façade of original houses
- Protection of the Park bowl area - not to allow new buildings
- Materials control e.g. boundary walls/lime mortar
- Utilise the Paddock area for children forest school
- Preservation orders for specific/significant trees in private

gardens - Stop infill development and loss of garden space

- Encourage new builds/extensions etc. that look modern but use building materials common to the Park - brick, Bulwell stone etc
- Green spaces - no reduction of these. Height of buildings - what about roof gardens are these suitable
- Article 4 directions for: new windows, rooflights, removal of chimneys on original houses
- HMOs to be refused due to noise and XXXX to way of life. Parking off road on development to reduce on road parking. Limit extremes of licensed premises e.g. Waltons
- Window replacement but only relating to period properties
- Limit excessive intrusion from doing large building work on neighbours
- Prevent conversion of useable garages and outbuildings into houses
- Trees: incentives to grow trees, wildlife, communal garden
- Better understanding of the preservation of the Parks USP by the LA and council who often give the impression the Park not that important going forward
- Developments in gardens
- Greater attention to be paid to the style of existing and particularly original buildings
- No development of garages as parking a problem everywhere in the Park
- Replacement windows
- Infilling: provision of parking within a development, materials used - awful

cladding on Barrack Lane, not in the Park but in conservation area

- No permitted development - all development subject to planning
- Rear 11 Western Terrace (next to 8 Pelham Crescent) couldn't get planning application (now on appeal), so land is just waste ground full of weeds and brambles and if planning permission refusal continues so will this eyesore
- Consider parking arrangements for any new developments
- Greater consideration about the intensity of habitation in the vicinity
- Negotiate protection for Park Bowl green space, and other green spaces - create Assets of Community Value for open spaces like this
- Proper tree management e.g. permitted repeated pollarding
- Incentives for tree planting
- Changes in windows and doors/rooflights (e.g. uPVC replacements) - felling of trees - solar panels
- Perhaps there should be more control over the number of cars allowed by each property
- Our 1960s bungalow has uPVC. If you take it back to its heritage it would have to be critical. How will you cost for regs differentiations
- Tree maintenance (road outside 8 Pelham Crescent) as tree completely covers gas lights so street is even darker. Needs plan to manage this.
- Noise: Music (bar), students, HMO, taxis, drinks late at night
- Electric charging points for every car in the next 20 years
- If plan insists uPVC is replaced by wood, will owners simply do nothing as they cannot afford the extra cost
- Off road parking: mandatory - no off road parking permits for new developments
- Incentive: Discount in council tax for number of spaces for off road parking
- On street parking because garages are being banned or limited to one per household
- Splitting houses into apartments and subsequent problems with parking
- Limit height of development around the edges of the Park. Don't want another monstrosity like the one at Canning Circus!

Question 4: Any other comments?

- Bear in mind there are many decaying garages (wrong size for a car) that need a purpose not decay
- The current management plan lacks policy direction up front and clear. The policies in the current document are not clear, not properly set out and therefore it is sadly ineffective.
- We all want to do the right thing - save and enhance the Park, it is how. Skyline including castle.
- Airbnb having all night parties
- For such a large area this meeting is poorly supported - apathy
- Active ace tennis area need sorting!
- Feeling that City Council is very anti the Park for political reasons
- Planning Dpt. Is no longer functioning and more and more developers are just starting and getting retrospective permission e.g. The Walton
- The Bowl is protected by a flaky covenant that if tested would probably collapse. It must be strengthened.
- A children's playground
- Better lighting
- Positive - restriction on business signage
- Increased biodiversity of public and private spaces
- Funicular up park steps (Thanks, Josie!)
- Add electric car charging in roads
- Add CCTV?
- Prevent excavated basement developments close to other properties
- Need to protect the appearance and quality of buildings of value that are more modern than those built before 1919 i.e. better quality homes from 1920s to 2019
- Electric charging points for cars
- Need dropped kerbs at every junction



7 Quantum House
3-5 College Street
Nottingham
NG1 5AQ

www.locusconsulting.co.uk