

Newark & Sherwood District
Council

Amended Allocations &
Development Management

DPD

Publication Consultation:

November 2022

Prepared by Fisher German LLP on
Behalf of Richborough Estates



01 Introduction

- 1.1 These representations are prepared on behalf of Richborough Estates in respect of their land interests at Allenby Road, Southwell, as illustrated on Figure 1 below. The site has been previously promoted and was included as a preferred residential site in the Allocations & Development Management Options Report (2011), however was not included in the subsequent adopted Plan in 2013.
- 1.2 The site remains a deliverable and logical location for growth within Southwell, a Service Centre behind only Newark, the Sub-Regional Centre, within the adopted Settlement Hierarchy, with the realistic prospect of the site being built out within 5 years.



Figure 1 - Illustrative Masterplan

- 1.3 These representations seek to demonstrate that whilst the Council consider that there has been sufficient land approved or committed and allocated to meet the notional minimum target for Southwell as set out in the Amended Core Strategy, that there is compelling justification for delivery of this site as an allocation.

Policy Framework

- 1.4 Newark and Sherwood District Council adopted the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy in March 2019 having formally reviewed the Council's original Core Strategy (2011). Now adopted, this document forms part of the Development Plan for the District. Considering the previous Allocations & Development Management DPD was formed in the context of the previous Core Strategy, it is necessary to review this document to ensure it is compliant with the Amended Core Strategy. Notwithstanding this, there have been a number of revisions to National Policy contained within the NPPF (with further revisions recently announced) and as such the Council must utilise this review to ensure the Plan remains consistent. Finally, in line with revised guidance there is an expectation that local authorities will review their Development Plan documents every five years¹. The Newark & Sherwood Allocations & Development Management DPD was adopted in July 2013, meaning the review process was necessary regardless of the above factors. This is to ensure that Local Authorities are constantly monitoring the performance of the Development Plan and there is opportunity to change it if it is not delivering as anticipated or there is a change in circumstances¹. The above is all material when considering the review of the Allocations & Development Management DPD.
- 1.5 The Core Strategy sets the spatial strategy and hierarchy for the District. Much like the previous incarnation, this document looks to direct significant levels of growth (60%) to the Sub-Regional Centre of Newark upon Trent and its wider urban area including Balderton and Fernwood.² Of the remaining growth, 30% is directed towards the Service Centres, while a remaining 10% is directed towards the Principal Villages. Of the growth directed towards the Service Centres, this is split between the 6 settlements³ within that tier. The split between Service Centres however is not equal, with different levels of growth directed towards the various settlements. Southwell, despite being the third largest settlement, and having the greatest retail offer outside of Newark, a leisure centre, a Secondary School and good public transport and local employment, is only apportioned 10% of the growth directed towards Service Centres, equating to only 3% of the District's Growth. As the residual Housing Requirement is 8,806 dwellings, this means the level of growth directed to Southwell is only 264 dwellings over the Plan period 2013-2033, equating to only 13 dwellings per annum average. This is not considered to be commensurate to Southwell's sustainability and

¹ Planning Practice Guidance – Plan Making – Paragraph 062

² Amended Core Strategy Spatial Policy 2

³ Southwell, Ollerton & Boughton, Rainworth, Clipstone and Edwinstowe.

spatial role.

- 1.6 Spatial Policy 9: Selecting Appropriate Sites for Allocation sets out a number of criteria by which new allocations must follow. This includes, amongst other things, being close to an existing settlement and be accessible and well related to existing facilities.
- 1.7 The Planning Practice Guidance outlines a number of informatives which local authorities may consider when determining whether a plan or policies within a plan should be updated. This includes where issues may have arisen which impact the deliverability of key site allocations.
- 1.8 Southwell benefits from a Neighbourhood Plan that was made in October 2016, which was developed to align with the original Core Strategy (adopted in March 2011) and Allocations & Development Management DPD (adopted in July 2013). Whilst it is necessary to be aware of the policies contained within this document, this Plan Review is not bound to follow the Neighbourhood Plan, particularly given this is more than 5 years old and based on the now outdated strategic policies contained within the 2011 Core Strategy. There is also a requirement to consider more recent information, evidence, and general context. In relation to the latter, in Southwell, it is particularly relevant that the Southwell Bypass is now not being delivered. This non-delivery is clearly a material change in circumstances and in this context the approach to development in Southwell needs to be properly considered, at a settlement level. Clearly the lack of this infrastructure would impact access to many of the Council's previously preferred sites and would reduce arguments that the majority of growth should be delivered to the east of the town, an approach which was based on the delivery of that infrastructure.
- 1.9 Notwithstanding this, planning law dictates that where there is a conflict within the Development Plan, it is the document made most recently which takes precedent⁴. Furthermore, it is not appropriate that an emerging District Plan be restrained by a Neighbourhood Plan, especially where the Neighbourhood Plan was originally based on the Plan being reviewed. Quite often, when strategic and district policies are reviewed, Neighbourhood Plan Groups conduct a Neighbourhood Plan Review to ensure there is no issue caused by this primacy. We understand that the Neighbourhood Plan Group are undertaking a Review of the Neighbourhood Plan, but as yet have not produced any evidence base or consultation material.

⁴ s.38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

02 Representations

So/Ho/1 – Land East of Allenby Road

- 2.1 As set out by the consultation document, this allocation has been fully built out and thus is deleted. This approach is sound and supported.

So/Ho/2 – Land south of Halloughton Road

- 2.2 This site is under construction and is largely built out. As per the Council's methodology until sites are delivered in their entirety, they are retained as allocations to ensure certainty of supply. We have no specific comments to make on the status of this allocation. Whilst the application being delivered is providing 50 units, 12 of these are supported living units and therefore may not qualify as full dwellings for the purposes of housing delivery. Therefore, delivery is assumed at 38 dwellings.

So/Ho/3 – Land at Nottingham Road

- 2.3 As set out by the consultation document, this allocation has been fully built out and thus is deleted. This approach is sound and supported.

So/Ho/4 – Land East of Kirklington Road

- 2.4 This site has a recent outline approval. This site is not anticipated to make a contribution to the Council's five-year housing land supply. We have no specific comments on this allocation.

So/Ho/5 – Lower Kirklington Road

- 2.5 The retention of So/Ho/5 is questioned. Similar to our comments on the Depot site (below), this site has had two recent planning applications refused, with the first application also having been dismissed at appeal. The site appears to have changed control since these refusals, with a new application submitted by Redrow Homes in June 2022 (22/01106/FULM), subsequently withdrawn in August 2022, with no new application forthcoming.

- 2.6 There appears to be an impasse in delivering an acceptable access to the site. The applicant of the first two planning applications and appeal's preferred solution was a 4-armed mini roundabout, stating that traffic lights were incongruous with the overriding character of Southwell. The Highways Authority however would not accept a 4-armed mini roundabout, requiring a traffic light arrangement to enter the site. This meant the applicant had to apply with traffic light junction, despite having outlined the inappropriateness of such an approach. Whilst this was the requirement of the Highways Authority this was not accepted by the Council's Planning Committee who agreed that the proposed traffic lights would harm the character of the settlement and as such forms one of the reasons for refusal. Paragraph 108 of the NPPF confirms that when considering whether a site should be allocated for development, it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Having regard for the severe doubts that must exist regarding the ability to successfully access the site, this allocation must now be regarded as undeliverable and should not be continued as an allocation, unless significant evidence can be provided outlining that an acceptable scheme is available on the site.
- 2.7 Whilst another access solution was advanced as part of the most recent application, prior to its withdrawal there was a further highways objection to the proposals, on the grounds of highways safety. Given this represents another objection on highways grounds, there is no clear evidence at the time of writing that a suitable scheme can be advanced. Given the site's planning history, with 3 applications and an appeal in the past 4 years, the obvious conclusion is the site is likely to be non-deliverable and should be deleted. Alternatively a replacement site should be delivered to ensure housing needs are met if the site cannot be delivered, such as our client's land which would deliver a scheme of a similar size, without the issues associated with this allocation.
- 2.8 There were further objections from parties such as Southwell Civic Society, who objected strongly against the proposals.
- 2.9 The difficulties in delivering this allocation clearly demonstrate fundamental issues with the site, which should not be doggedly relied upon when there remains suitable alternatives which do not have the same fundamental issues. The Council's approach to continue to allocate the site is not effective or justified, nor consistent with national policy. This allocation should therefore be removed to meet the tests of soundness.

So/Ho/6 – Land at The Burgage (Rainbows)

- 2.10 As set out by the consultation document, this allocation has been fully built out and thus is deleted. This approach is sound and supported.

So/Ho/7 – Southwell Depot

- 2.11 As set out in the consultation document, a number of sites that were allocated in Southwell as part of the Allocations & Development Management DPD had to take into account the protected route of the proposed Southwell Bypass. This protected route has now been deleted from the County Council's road programme following the imposition of a weight limit and a declassification of the former A612 road between the A617 and Lowdham. This change affects So/Ho/7, So/E/2 and So/E3.
- 2.12 The District Council has proposed that due to the bypass being removed, So/Ho/7 (Southwell Depot) should be increased in size from 15 to 18 dwellings, and that the boundary of So/E/2 (Land east of Crew Lane) and So/E/3 (Land south of Crew Lane) should be moved to the existing urban edge. As noted above, we consider that the whole strategy of development for Southwell should be considered afresh, not just the eastern edge of the town. It is not sound nor appropriate to continue a strategy developed on the basis of key infrastructure delivery, if that infrastructure is no longer to be delivered, as the benefits afforded in respect of linking housing and employment delivery with the new road now will not be realised.
- 2.13 Considering So/Ho/7 (Southwell Depot), it is first necessary to consider the site's planning history. In 2016 an application for 9 dwellings was refused on the basis of reasons related to housing mix, density, design, impact on trees, impact on privacy of existing dwellings, archaeology and highway safety. Some of the reasons for refusal seem to contradict each other. For example, the density reason for refusal sets out that the site does not make efficient use of land, thus suggesting that further dwellings should be located on the site. However, increasing the number of units would undoubtedly worsen issues relating to impacts on trees, highway safety and privacy. Whilst the officer has set out some forms of development which may be acceptable, there has been no masterplanning provided that we have seen which demonstrates how a comprehensive layout can be delivered on the site having regard for the site's constraints.

- 2.14 Following refusal of the 2016 planning application, the applicant sought to appeal the decision. However, the appeal was dismissed in September 2021 due to inappropriate housing mix, impacts on Southwell Conservation area, impacts on trees, impacts on privacy and highway safety.
- 2.15 A second application was submitted in May 2021 for 13 dwellings but was withdrawn due to the Council recommending refusal of the application. Outstanding issues related to parking, design, impacts on conservation area, issues relating to trees, lack of ecology evidence and drainage.
- 2.16 On the above basis, it is clear that the site is proving difficult to deliver and as such the key question for this Plan is whether or not the site should continue to be allocated at all, let alone that the notional capacity of the site should be increased. If the Council are to persist with this allocation, then it will be incumbent on the Council or promoter to provide a layout which shows how a scheme can be delivered on the site having regard for the myriad of issues demonstrably present on site with no solution. This site has been allocated since 2013 and the fact that so many fundamental issues remain demonstrates that the site is likely non-deliverable. Many of the issues would logically lead to the conclusion at the very least the notional capacity of the site should be reduced. Despite this the Council are now attempting to increase delivery on the site. This approach, and the allocation more generally, is not sound, as it is not justified or effective.
- 2.17 Having regard for the clear issues with the site it should be de-allocated. If the Council are to persist with an allocation, significant evidence will be needed to satisfactorily address all known issues. Given the site is brownfield, and thus could come forward under normal windfall rules, the need for an allocation is questioned, particularly given the known issues relating to the site. De-allocation would not preclude the site coming forward but would only require that any application satisfied all issues relating to the redevelopment of the site. As such, unless evidence is provided, the site should be removed as an allocation. It is noted that the Council's 5-year housing land supply evidence assumes 15 dwellings, albeit not within the five-year period.

So/MU/1 – Land at Former Minster School

- 2.18 As set out by the consultation document, the land at the Former Minister School is no longer available for development thus the continuation of the allocation would not have been sound, in that it would have been neither effective, justified or consistent with national policy. As such the

proposed removal of this allocation for 13 dwellings is considered to be entirely sensible.

So/E/1 – Southwell - Crew Lane Industrial Estate Policy Area

- 2.19 We have no specific comments on this policy – save for those outlined in respect of So/E/2, So/E/3 and So/RL/1.

So/E/2 – Land East of Crew Lane

- 2.20 The approach in respect of So/E/2 is supported and it is considered that Crew Lane remains the most logical approach to future employment land delivery in the Southwell. As discussed below, Crew Lane is the only real area of employment land within Southwell, so for the continued economic self-sufficiency of the settlement, it is of vital importance that sufficient employment land is safeguarded, including beyond the next Plan period. It is however noted that the reduction of employment area will mean other employment sites should be retained to mitigate this loss.

So/E/3 – Land South of Crew Lane

- 2.21 The deletion of the So/E/3 designation is not supported. Whilst the Council's approach has been amended since the previous consultation, and the land is now safeguarded for all uses, rather than just housing, we consider this site to be the only logical longstanding potential employment site, beyond So/E/2 which will be delivered through the next plan period.
- 2.22 The removal of this employment land in lieu of additional housing is something which we considered to be entirely inappropriate. When looking strategically at Southwell, particularly in the long term, the area at Crew Lane is the only area of significant employment in the town. As such, it represents the most appropriate location for future employment growth. We would object to any approach which would serve to sterilise this area for future employment growth. Future housing growth could be delivered, more sensitively, in other parts of the town, whereas we do not consider that future employment provision could. Whilst the landowner may have more immediate aspirations for the delivery of residential development, and the Town Council keen to ensure future residential development is out of sight of existing properties, these are not material planning considerations in the public interest or the holistic long term planning of Southwell. The need for land to be retained south of Crew Lane for employment uses is further demonstrated by the presence of areas of flood risk to the north of So/E/2 which reduces the size of the retained allocation. If the land to the south is lost to residential development, this could sterilise employment generating uses to the north of Crew Lane by adding new sensitive receptors

immediately adjacent to retained allocated employment land.

2.23 We provide more substantive comments on the updated approach in respect of So/RL/1 below.

Policy So/RL/1 - Southwell - Reserved Land to the south of Crew Lane

2.24 Whilst we are somewhat supportive of the change since the previous iteration of the Plan, that the land is safeguarded for 'development needs', rather than housing specifically, we still have significant concerns that the application of this policy essentially prejudices proper consideration of future development strategies in Southwell and could result in the inability to properly deliver So/E/2.

2.25 It is not clear why any land needs to be safeguarded in Southwell. The locality does not contain Green Belt and thus there is no requirement to predetermine future Local Plan due process. This allocation in essence, seemingly pre-allocates this site for some use in some future Plan. It is not clear why this is required, particularly given it is not an approach adopted anywhere else in the Plan. Given the future use is not known, we do not see how this designation can be properly tested through the SA, given it is impossible to test reasonable alternatives. It is noticeable when our client's land interests were removed through the previous iteration of Plan making, the land was not arbitrarily safeguarded. If it is not required to meet the development needs of this Plan, then it should revert to Countryside to enable full future consideration again as part of a thorough Local Plan process.

2.26 The safeguarding of land for non-descript future uses is not sound, as it is not effective or justified. There is no planning reason why it requires safeguarding, as it is not clear what it is being safeguarded from. There is no reason why this land should be treated any different to any other omission site within the Plan. The above is particularly concerning given it forms a pattern of allocations which previously related to a piece of road infrastructure which is now not being delivered.

2.27 The only use for which the safeguarding would make any sense would be specifically for employment uses, given it is likely the only location in Southwell capable of delivering this use that will likely be required at some point in the future. As mentioned earlier, having regard for the sensitive nature of Southwell, the delivery of employment in other locations would be very challenging. Residential development, however, can more sensitivity be located elsewhere in

Southwell, in particular this has been demonstrated through the planning approvals east of Allenby Lane (built by Miller Homes) and land east of Kirklington Road. Our client's land west of Allenby Road would clearly constitute a suitable location for future residential growth. In this regard, unless significant evidence is provided regarding the long-term capacity for Southwell to deliver employment land post 2033, we would object to any policy which would seek to prevent the natural and obvious use of the site being realised, to prevent Southwell residents from becoming fully reliant on distance commuting.

- 2.28 This designation is further problematic in how it will impact an allocated employment site So/E/2. The Policy states *"development proposals which prejudice this approach will not normally be considered appropriate"*. This could be inferred to mean that employment proposals coming forward on So/E/2 would be required to have no adverse impact on the reserve site, despite it having no formal planning use or function beyond agricultural uses. This is clearly not appropriate and not sound, and would be not be an issue if the designation was simply reverted back to countryside, enabling the full delivery of So/E/2 in that context. This is particularly pertinent given that growth to the north of So/E/2 is restricted by flood risk.
- 2.29 Having regard for the above, we conclude that the proposed Policy So/RL/1 is not sound, in that it is not justified or effective and the application of this policy is somewhat arbitrary, with no clear policy function. It predetermines future plan making without having gone through the appropriate process itself. As such, this designation should be deleted, or it should be made clear it is to be retained for employment uses, as this approach can actually be justified. Any reference to residential safeguarding should be explicit with in the Policy that this does not preclude the need to test the site against alternative options as part of any future Plan making.

Housing Need

- 2.30 The loss of the Former Minister School, Southwell Depot and Lower Kirklington Road allocations would lead to a shortfall of housing delivery within Southwell – see Figure 1 below. This demonstrates that just 208 dwellings are likely to be delivered, despite being directed 264 dwellings to the town (and notional allocations equating to 298 dwellings). This equates to a shortfall of 56 dwellings in the town.

Allocation	Address	Capacity in Adopted A&DM DPD	Capacity in A&DM Publication Paper	Our Updated Capacity	Status
So/Ho/1	Land East of Allenby Road	65	65	67	Complete
So/Ho/2	Land South of Halloughton Road	45	45	38	Under Construction
So/Ho/3	Land at Nottingham Road	30	30	33	Complete
So/Ho/4	Land East of Kirklington Road	45	45	45	Allocation
So/Ho/5	Land off Lower Kirklington Road	60	60	0	Allocation
So/Ho/6	Land at The Burgage (Rainbows)	25	25	25	Complete
So/Ho/7	Southwell Depot	15	18	0	Allocation
So/MU/1	Land at the former Minster School	13	0	0	De-allocated
Total		298	288	208	Total

Figure 2: Site Allocations in Southwell

- 2.31 Whilst this shortfall may not result in an overall shortfall across the District, it does result in a shortfall within the settlement, which does not accord with the spatial strategy, and as a consequence replacement allocations should be made to meet the shortfall. It is not sound to simply assume that there is no justification to replace these allocations.
- 2.32 Similarly, whilst there may be some windfall development, this will not provide the vitally needed S106 funding for infrastructure, or most importantly, affordable housing, and thus would cause demonstrable harm if this was used to as justification to reduce major housing development in Southwell.
- 2.33 The Council are also reminded that it is incumbent upon them to seek to boost significantly the supply of housing, in accordance with National Policy. The targets contained in the Core Strategy are minimums, not maximums and as part of future reviews of the strategic housing requirement, increases in housing requirement above local housing need may be adopted to help achieve economic growth for example. Given the low levels of growth directed towards Southwell generally, there are likely to be significant positives through increasing delivery levels within this key Service Centre settlement. This would support existing services and facilities. It is noted that there appears to be capacity at local schools also.

- 2.34 The Council are also reminded that it is necessary to maintain housing delivery and a five-year supply of housing land and there must be a demonstrably robust land supply at the Examination or the Planning Inspector cannot find the Plan sound. As such, we consider there is significant merit in replacing any allocations lost to ensure a continued integrity of supply.
- 2.35 It is further noted that the original Core Strategy outlined that Southwell *'has a serious housing need which is perpetuated by high local house prices'*. We have seen no evidence that this is an issue which has been resolved. Despite this, adopted planning policy has sought to continue to restrict housing growth in the town to only a very low level. We do not agree that the level of housing directed to Southwell is commensurate to either its sustainability or likely levels of housing need. The Amended Core Strategy directs only 3% of the housing requirement here (10% of the Service Centre growth). This will not sufficiently improve affordability within the settlement and the reality is that without sufficient growth affordability is likely to worsen. Post pandemic rates of home working are likely to increase significantly. The lack of a need to be close to the office will see many professionals seek to move from larger centres into the more attractive settlements such as Southwell.
- 2.36 The Newark and Sherwood 2020 Housing Needs Assessment⁵ illustrates that in terms of median house prices, houses in the Southwell Sub-Area (which in terms of properties is predominantly Southwell) have increased by 39.3% since 2007. The Southwell Sub-Area also has the second highest house prices in the District at £348,226, narrowly below the Nottingham Fringe Sub-Area at £386,193, but significantly above both the next highest Sub-Area, Collingham at £279,437 and even more so above the Newark and Sherwood Median at £211,644.
- 2.37 In terms of affordability, the Council's Housing Needs assessment sets out that the median gross household income in the Southwell Sub-Area is £32,500⁶. As set out above, the Median house price in the Southwell Sub-Area is £348,226. This equates to a median house price to median gross annual income ratio of 10.7, i.e. a house is over 10 times the mean income. For context, this compares to only 7.99 for the district as a whole (ONS Ratio of median house price to median gross annual (where available) workplace-based earnings by local authority district, England and Wales, Year 2021 (published 2022)). This shows that Southwell is demonstrably more

⁵ Table 3.4 Newark and Sherwood 2020 Housing Needs Assessment

⁶ Table 2.12 Newark and Sherwood 2020 Housing Needs Assessment

unaffordable than Newark and Sherwood as whole. It is important to note that this metric does not consider affordability by utilising house prices as the sole metric, but it looks at house prices in comparison with earnings, demonstrating the level of affordability. As previously mentioned, with increased freedoms in terms of working now afforded through a significant post pandemic growth in home working, there is likely to be somewhat of a migration from urban centres to attractive locations such as Southwell, further increasing demand and house prices and likely displacing current residents, particularly those who do not qualify for social housing but will be out competed for available stock by higher earning professionals.

- 2.38 Notwithstanding the above, the Council's own Housing Needs Assessment (Southwell Sub-area Summary) sets out that in the Southwell Sub-Area there is a there is an annual need for 54 affordable dwellings per annum, including 32 homes for annual rent. Having regard for the restrictive approach to new housing in the Sub-Area, particularly the sustainable settlement of Southwell itself, this figure will not be delivered as currently planned. Whilst provision may be made elsewhere in the District, this will increase commuting or result in issues of social isolation or exclusion with people being dispersed from the settlement.
- 2.39 The availability of sites which have been previously assessed as acceptable indicate that there is little justification in restricting further growth here. Southwell is a highly sustainable settlement, the third largest in the District, and benefiting from the best retail offer outside of Newark. As such it is considered growth can be brought well above the 264 dwellings established in the Amended Core Strategy. Such housing targets contained within the Amended Core Strategy are minimums and not maximums, and it is entirely reasonable and consistent with national policy to seek to deliver levels of growth in excess of minimum targets as part of this Review. This is particularly pertinent in areas such as Southwell, which have well documented affordability and house-type composition issues. Whilst a larger than expected level of windfall growth has provided for housing growth in Southwell above what was likely expected, windfall sites do not deliver the same range of benefits as allocations, which can provide affordable housing and significant contributions towards local services and infrastructure. Windfall growth can therefore be very damaging, in that it increases the pressure of local services and facilities, but rarely are developer contributions secured to facilitate the subsequent population growth. As per the NPPF, growth should be Planned.

- 2.40 The Council's Housing Monitoring and 5 Year Land Supply Report, covering 2013/14 to 2019/20 (the most recent available), states that only 30 affordable homes have been delivered in Southwell, at a rate of only 4 per annum. Whilst this is likely to have improved in the years since, it will not have satisfied the acute affordable housing need in Southwell. Having regard for the likely issues relating to affordability as discussed above, it is considered this will significantly be outstripped by increasing affordable housing demand, not least in the coming years.
- 2.41 Considering these points, we consider there to be compelling justification to allocate additional residential land within Southwell.

03 Land West of Allenby Road, Southwell

- 3.1 Having regard for the significant justification for further residential allocations within Southwell, as discussed above, these representations seek the allocation of Land West of Allenby Road, Southwell. This site was a preferred residential site within the preparatory stages of the Allocations & Development Management DPD (Options Report October 2011).




Figure 3 - Policy Map Extract from the Allocations & Development Management DPD Options Paper (2011)

- 3.2 The supporting text for the site's inclusion as an allocation stated that "the site is located on an important gateway into the Town and, as a result, any development would need to be sensitive to

this, possibly incorporating landscape buffering to the North. Aside from this issue, no significant constraints were identified as part of the assessment and therefore the site is considered suitable for residential development."

- 3.3 Despite having been classed as suitable, it was removed prior to the submission of the DPD for Examination. The predominant reason for the site's deallocation was due to conclusions contained within the Southwell Gateway Sites Assessment 2012. However, the Southwell Gateway Site Assessment is considered very narrow in its focus and unbalanced in its reporting. It places considerable emphasis on the issue of 'existing' screening at the expense of other relevant landscape and visual matters.
- 3.4 Each of the site-specific policies for the existing allocations on housing sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 for Southwell all required that *"Appropriate design, density and layout which addresses the sites gateway location and manages the transition into the main built up area"*. Clearly the same wording and requirement could have been placed on Land West of Allenby Road in order to assimilate development sensitively. We remain of the view that the original deallocation of the site was not sound, and it can make a valuable contribution towards assisting meeting needs moving forward as well as the immediate shortfall of 56 dwellings in Southwell.
- 3.5 The site remains suitable and available for development, being promoted by experienced and respected residential land promoters Richborough Estates. There are no constraints that would restrict its development, and unlike other allocations within the settlement, contains no ecological or landscape designations. In reality the site is well related to existing built form and serves as an entirely logical location for future growth.
- 3.6 There is compelling justification to allocate additional land within Southwell as part of the review of the A&DM DPD; firstly, the undeliverability of allocations So/Ho/5, So/Ho/7 and So/MU/2. Whilst the Council have taken the view that housing needs for the settlement are still catered for by commitments and units delivered, it is considered that this approach would not be consistent with national policy which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. Furthermore, smaller windfall schemes do not deliver affordable housing or other vital contributions towards infrastructure, therefore not seeking to replace the loss of this allocation, would directly and unjustly reduce the delivery of affordable housing which is vitally needed in the settlement as

discussed above. The land at Allenby Road would deliver a comparable quantum of units as So/Ho/5 and as such would replace the loss of this allocation neatly. Even if this allocation was to be delivered, the social benefits afforded by the allocation of our client's land would still be significant given issues with affordable housing need.

- 3.7 Secondly, Richborough Estates have confirmed that they are prepared to deliver a scheme including a number of bungalows as per the wishes of the Town Council and Neighbourhood Plan. It is clear that the delivery of bungalows is very important to the people of Southwell and as such great weight should be applied to schemes which seek to deliver this housing type. The delivery of bungalows will also serve to free up market housing, by enabling those wishing to downsize to do so. Under occupancy within Southwell was recently evidenced as being over 50%, which is significant. It is noted that other schemes in the village have sought to deliver below policy compliant levels of bungalows or even no bungalows. The allocation of this site affords the Council an opportunity to deliver a significant proportion of the bungalow requirement.
- 3.8 Thirdly, the Council have a requirement to maintain, throughout the plan period, a robust and sufficient supply of housing land to meet the needs for the next five years. The Council need to ensure sufficient land is available to meet such needs. Recent appeals, and new PPG guidance⁷ have outlined that previous delivery cannot be used to reduce future requirements and as such the Council must have a sufficient supply of sites moving forward. The potential loss of site So/Ho/5 means that there is a reduction in housing land supply which must be accounted for.
- 3.9 Fourthly, it is considered there is an opportunity to deliver an attractive, landscape-led scheme which will be an appropriate gateway to the settlement of Southwell. This is particularly relevant when considering the proposed gateway delivered through the Miller scheme to the east of Allenby Road. Whilst this scheme does benefit from a reasonable level of existing boundary treatment, the built form delivered by this scheme as one enters Southwell from the west along Halam Road would be a very urban entrance to the settlement with an immediate row of dwellings and delivered at a high density adjacent to the settlement edge.

⁷ Planning Practice Guidance – Housing Supply and delivery – Paragraph 032



Figure 4 - Approved plans to the East of Allenby Road

3.10 The Masterplan for the development of land west of the Miller scheme would provide a more suitable gateway entrance to Southwell, including a large, landscaped area to the west (Figure 5 and Appendix A) delivered through the provision of public open space, landscaping and land suitable for biological net gains. Development here would also serve to round-off the settlement in this location and would not intrude unduly into the open countryside, particularly having regard for the development to the south and east of the site.



Figure 5 - Proposed Illustrative Masterplan's relationship with existing built form of Southwell

3.11 Initial survey work has been undertaken on various matters to support the sites promotion. This includes initial work on both highways and drainage. Specialist highways consultants have considered the site and do not believe there are any issues with regards to access. The site is proposed to be accessed from Allenby Road to the east of the site. Visibility splays achievable from this proposed site entrance are to the junction to the north (45m) and 59m south, both suitable for typical 85th percentile speeds on a 30mph road. This is demonstrated at Appendix B – Proposed Site Access Junction.

3.12 With regards to flood and drainage matters, a Technical Note has been prepared by specialist drainage consultants, found at Appendix C. The Technical Note confirms that the site is located entirely in Flood Zone 1 and is a significant distance from the nearest major watercourses, The Dumbles, The River Greet and the Potwell Dyke.

3.13 The Environment Agency surface water flood map shows there is a high surface water risk along Halam Road and along the northern boundary of the site, however no significant risks are noted extending into the site area or across the rest of the site, and appropriate standoffs will ensure no impact to the proposed development.

3.14 Southwell has been the subject of a detailed hydraulic modelling. The study was carried out by URS(AECOM) and completed in September 2015. The model shows the highway drainage along Halam Road is overwhelmed by short duration high intensity events and this has been reflected in surface water mapping. In order to ensure this risk is managed the following is proposed:

- Updated site-specific modelling using relevant updated modelling parameters and site-specific topographical survey data to determine site specific risks.
- Provision of appropriate standoff's from Halam Road to ensure no development is located in high risk areas.
- Provision of suitable Finished Floor Levels.
- Surface water drainage system which will convey flows to an attenuation system designed for a 1 in 100-year return period, plus 40% climate change with discharge rates restricted to better than Greenfield runoff rates.
- Additional mitigation measures if deemed necessary

3.15 The British Geological Survey map shows the bedrock geology comprises mudstone and siltstone and the topography of the site is such that any emergence of groundwater would be expected to flow south to the ditch along Halam Road. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the area suggests that there is no history of groundwater flooding in the district. Consequently, the site is considered to be at a low risk of groundwater flooding however it is recommended a ground investigation is carried out on site in due course to confirm the flood risk from groundwater and any required mitigation. Whilst formal infiltration testing will be undertaken in due course, this is unlikely to be successful and infiltration has been discounted as a feasible method for surface water disposal.

3.16 It is therefore envisaged surface water flows will discharge either to the existing ditch network along Halam Road or to the existing 675mm diameter surface water sewer to the east of the site. A connection to the surface water sewer would mimic the drainage strategy for the adjacent Miller

Homes scheme. Both the ditch adjacent to the site and the surface water sewer outfall to the ditch network adjacent to the Norwood Park Balancing Pond and surface water flows from the site currently discharge into this area based on topography.

- 3.17 The final connection point for the site will be subject to further discussions with the Lead Local Flood Authority and Severn Trent Water. A surface water drainage strategy for the site is being developed based on the QBAR discharge rate of 5l/s for all storm events. It is estimated 1,300 cubic metres of storage would be required allowing for the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change storm event. The Q100 greenfield run off rate for the site is 12.9l/s and so controlling flows to 5l/s in all storm events will result in a 61% betterment over existing greenfield runoff rates.
- 3.18 Runoff from the development will be collected via a piped network running under the roads within the site. This shall then be conveyed to the north eastern corner and a new detention basin. A hydro-brake or similar flow control will limit the peak runoff from the site to 5l/s.
- 3.19 The drainage strategy will take account of the SuDS Manual CIRIA document C753 which indicates the minimum treatment indices appropriate for contributing pollution hazards for different land use classifications.
- 3.20 The Environment Agency's Flood Risk from Reservoirs mapping shows that the site is not at risk of being inundated due to failure of any reservoirs. There are no other artificial water bodies located close to the site.
- 3.21 With regards to foul water drainage, the new development is served by a foul water network that will collect flows from the proposed buildings on-site and discharge to the existing Severn Trent Water sewer to the east of the site. It is envisaged a connection will be made to the new sewer network to be laid in Halam Road as part of the Miller Homes scheme, however if this is not available connections will be made further east at Hopkiln Lane. Final agreement of the discharge rate and arrangements shall be confirmed within a Section 106 agreement.

3.22 Considering the above, we consider there is significant justification to justify the allocation of the land west of Allenby Road. There are no technical constraints which would prevent the delivery of this site.

- A detailed access drawing has been provided at Appendix B which takes the form of a priority T-junction and is in keeping with other access junctions in the immediate area. Existing traffic flows in the area are low, and as a result the site access junction will operate within acceptable levels of capacity.
- There is no known contamination.
- The site lies in Flood Zone 1 and surface water risk will be mitigated via a surface water drainage strategy with adequate onsite attenuation
- Ecologically at the site is not constrained. A number of enhancements will be provided to deliver a net biodiversity gain.
- Development would not impact on designated heritage assets.
- There are no utilities constraints.
- The site is in the single ownership, with no restrictions on the land or ransom strips.
- The site is immediately deliverable and there is significant interest from housebuilders wishing to acquire the site, there are no issues of viability and thus could deliver an affordable compliant provision of affordable housing.

3.23 The allocation could include appropriate criteria for the provision of landscaping and open space on the western edge of the site between the existing public footpath and the site boundary.

3.24 For these reasons we consider the site to be suitable, deliverable and available and should be allocated for development.

Appendix A

Appendix B

Appendix C