

P&DG

BEESTON MARINA LTD.

DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION:

OUR RESPONSE

Dear P&DG,

Beeston and District Civic Society welcomes the opportunity to give comment on your proposal.

The Society wholly objects to the principle represented in your public engagement leaflet. We do so for the following reasons:

1. This is **not** a Brownfield land site. The below is taken from Nottingham insight mapping. Hatching indicates where important nature sites are; and if there was brownfield land this would also be shown.



2. The current chalets offer lots of individual interest which makes this a fascinating area for pedestrians. These chalets also provide lower cost housing; something the borough is desperately short of. They also provide a network of gardens - which are valuable green space for residents, passersby and wildlife.
3. The proposal obstructs the riverside flyway which runs uninterrupted along several miles of our stretch of the Trent Valley. It also blocks the unhindered views for existing residents.
4. There are mature trees, and hedgerow on the site which do not appear on any of the plans shown. Garden space would also be lost. Landscaping is not shown on the plans either meaning there would be significant loss of biodiversity rather than any gain (BNG).

5. This site is near to **valuable natural sites**; there is no acknowledgement of this in the document that has been circulated.
6. This site is an important part of wildlife corridor to Attenborough Nature Reserve. How is biodiversity being considered; there is no mention of it?
7. The development is in close proximity to a number of heritage assets, recorded on the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record and the CRT Historic Asset List. The consultation document does not acknowledge this, nor does it consider the contribution that the setting of these Heritage Assets make to their significance (NPPF Para 189), which would be impacted upon negatively by this proposal.
We also draw to the developers attention that under NPPF paragraph 185, LPA's are required to take account of: *"d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place."*
8. The proposed development would negatively impact the heritage of the adjacent site, and wider context.
9. A three/four story building is out of scale with its surroundings; which are either of two stories or of one story.
10. The ground floor will present a faceless wall to the canal towing path and to the important corner with Canalside.
11. The design has no precedent and is not reflective of any older canal side buildings in the wider area. It is monstrously uninspiring and unimaginative, totally out of context with the local setting and overpowers adjacent facilities and properties.
12. There is no mention of sustainability in the proposal to be positive about - such as SuDS, rainwater harvesting, wildlife habitat, local energy generation, sustainability of materials used etc.
13. There is no amenity space provided in the development whatsoever; other than as glazed balconies and rooftop 'areas'.
14. The massing of the development has no precedent, is not reflective of any older canal side buildings in the wider area, and is wholly inappropriate for this location and site.
15. "Basement-level" car parking concerns us greatly, due to the site's proximity to the canal; river; lock and neighbouring properties - both in respect of excavation and engineering work required during development, and the flood risk thereafter.
16. Will its construction weaken the existing river, lock and canal infrastructure?
17. How will this and its construction affect flood defences leading from Riverside Road down to the footpath and also around the Lock and Cottages?
18. The density of the building will result in a probable concentration of residents causing an imbalance of the community, rather than mixed community.
19. The increase in noise will be damaging to the character of the area, to its nearest neighbours, and to the natural site it neighbours.
20. Increased vehicular traffic will be damaging to the character of the area, and to the natural site it neighbours.
21. The loss of light to surrounding properties and environment will be damaging to the character of the area, its nearest neighbours on South Road, Riverside Road and the and to the natural site it neighbours.
22. There is reduced public transport in this area - with bus services thinned and irregular, and some services removed altogether. This means that **at least** 29 extra residents' will be reliant on a car through what is an already congested area with narrow roads and parking on both sides..
23. How will the increase in the density in this area be accommodated without some investment by the developer in improvements in local infrastructure and public amenities? Where will be their school, dentist or doctor surgery?

We look forward to further updates on the progression of this, or any other proposal for this site.

Faithfully,
BCS Planning + Heritage group

On behalf of

Beeston and District Civic Society