

Appendix B

From: Michael Ainley
Sent: 03 September 2012 17:21
To: 'matthew.norton@nsdc.info'
Subject: DPD Response Forms incorrectly updated by N&S DC onto their web site - misleading statistics / information

Dear Mr Norton,

I see that Newark and Sherwood DC (N&S DC) have now posted the public's completed "Representation Forms" onto N&S DC's web site following the public consultation period of your chosen DPD.

I note that the Springfield Land South of Halloughton Rd (DPD ref: SO/HO/2, Options report ref: SO/HO/3) details 41 representation comments and (Becketts Field) land off Nottingham Rd (DPD ref: SO/HO/3, Options report ref: SO/HO/2) has 24 assigned to it, whereas other sites have minimal representation comments posted. As can be seen in my fourth item below, N&S DC have mixed up HO/2 and HO/3 and duplicated DPD ref: SO/HO/2 responses into DPD ref: SO/HO/3 as the real count is only 7 representation forms relating to Becketts Field DPD ref SO/HO/3 - Surely this is a strong indication that the Springfield Land South of Halloughton Rd (DPD ref: SO/HO/2, Options report ref: SO/HO/3) is the centre of a lot of concern or dare I say "controversy"!

Firstly, having looked at the 41 comments relating to the Springfield Land South of Halloughton Rd (DPD ref: SO/HO/2, Options report ref: SO/HO/3) I notice that the first representation form is from Christopher Holroyd (Cllr Armstrong's brother whom lives in the USA and whom is part owner of the land being put up for development) and is who submitted this land for development in 2008 as part of Newark and Sherwood DC's SHLAA process. Cllr Armstrong is not however listed although a co owner of this land and then Cabinet Member at N&S DC and also on the strategic planning committee for SHLAA. Surely owners of land put up for development should not be allowed to submit representation forms upon their own land (to which they stand to make financial gain) during the public consultation?, is no one vetting the representation forms?

Secondly, I notice that the vast majority (37 out of 41) of representation forms are opposed to the development of Land South of Halloughton Rd (DPD ref: SO/HO/2, Options report ref: SO/HO/3) being developed and those few in favour are the part land owner (as above) and Southwell Care Project whom inappropriately announced during the consultation periods that "if Springfield Land South of Halloughton Rd gets approval for development, they will gain a gift of a free of charge property (Springfield Bungalow / Cllr Armstrong's home address)"!

Thirdly, I notice that some of response forms have got the land references mixed up given N&S DC's idea to re-reference the various sites as I anticipated would happen at the time N&S DC announced what they were doing (see attached questions to Council during the Public Meeting dated 24th May 2012 and their response).

Unfortunately not only members of the general public have got the sites mixed up with one another... so have your own personnel (see fourth item below) and also an Elected Member Councillor (Peter Harris) when returning his responses. He stated

"It is unsound to persist with sites So/Ho/3, So/Ho/4 and So/Ho5. The dwellings allocated to these

sites are allocated in higher densities on more sustainable sites elsewhere in the town including So/Ho/6, So/Ho/3 and So/Ho7. Sites So/Ho/3, So/Ho/4 and So/Ho/5 are to be deleted....."

I have been informed and have seen correspondence confirming what Cllr Harris was trying to convey was increased density on Becketts Field DPD ref: SO/HO/3 and delete Springfield Land South of Halloughton Road DPD ref: SO/HO/2 (Options report ref: SO/HO/3).

I understand that Cllr. Peter Harris has expressed his concerns regarding his representation form and the mix up on site references (SO/HO/2 and SO/HO/3).

Fourthly, I notice that N&S DC have incorrectly positioned comments (representation forms) mixing up SO/HO/3 with SO/HO/2 as question number 3 of the representation form which incidentally did not ask for the site reference, but instead asked for "Paragraph", "Policy" & "Proposals Map". As such N&S DC have typed this in themselves when updating the web site and allocating representation forms to different site references.

In the absence of any section Newark & Sherwood's DC's on your Representation Forms for the site reference my wife Louise Ainley did state in bold (also underlined and larger text) at the top of the comments section both the DPD ref SO/HO/2 and the Options Report Ref SO/HO/3 and what you describe the land as "Land South of Halloughton Road" (the local people all know it as Springfield Land) to remove any ambiguity caused by the re-numbering system from the Options Report to the DPD Report and yet N&S DC have allotted her representation forms to the wrong site (DPD ref SO/HO/3 Options Report Ref: SO/HO/2) land off Nottingham Road (the local people all know it as Becketts Field) along with others such as Mr B. Spears, Mr I. Wigham for example.

As detailed on the N&S DC web site however 17 of the 24 representation forms posted to DPD ref SO/HO/3 really relate to SO/HO/2 and have been duplicated by N&S DC.

Amended count reflective of the 17 number incorrectly duplicated to Becketts Field (DPD ref: S/HO/3) by NSDC.

DPD Ref	Number of Representation Forms
SO/HO/1	5
SO/HO/2	41
SO/HO/3	24
SO/HO/4	15
SO/HO/5	8
SO/HO/6	8
SO/HO/7	5
SO/MU1	10
SO/PH1	3
SO/HN	3
SO/E1	6
SO/E2	2
SO/E3	1
SO/DC	0
SO/MOA	2
SO/PV	5
SO/WH	2

DPD Ref	Number of Representation Forms	Those Against	% Against
SO/HO/1	5		
SO/HO/2	41	37	90
SO/HO/3	7		
SO/HO/4	15		
SO/HO/5	8		
SO/HO/6	8		
SO/HO/7	5		
SO/MU1	10		
SO/PH1	3		
SO/HN	3		
SO/E1	6		
SO/E2	2		
SO/E3	1		
SO/DC	0		
SO/MOA	2		
SO/PV	5		
SO/WH	2		

I could say "I told you so" as this problem of mixing up the references was predicted and fully outlined by myself during the meeting of Full Council on the 24th May 2012 (copy attached). The Council response at that time was to ridicule my concerns and that it made absolute sense to re-designate the references !

It should be clear to you now, as it was clear to me from the outset, that this was a completely avoidable situation.

I now understand that presumably by the same departments that said the reference changes would not cause confusion, that we need not worry as the Inspector would not be confused. I also presume that as NSDC departments/Members will be the ones with whom the Inspector consults during the process. Consequently, I do not share the confidence that the departments/Members will be too keen to highlight that they created/supported a process whereby the public and indeed its own elected members were so confused by the re-used and exchanged references that the representation forms were compiled and published in such a botched fashion.

At every stage the Council appears to have been on a course of predetermination on this piece of land (options ref : SO/HO/3 , DPD ref SO/HO/2) part owned by an Elected Member. Clear breaches of the Code of Conduct have been allowed with no sanction, lobbying by individuals and groups with a pecuniary interests have been allowed and now as predicted, artificial confusion has been created to "muddy the waters" particularly around the objections to the site.

What really needs to happen in my opinion is for the Springfield Land South of Halloughton Rd (DPD ref: SO/HO/2, Options report ref: SO/HO/3) to be removed from being a preferred site without delay and increased density applied to suitable sites in the current town boundary in line with NPPF: March 2012 and precedents already set in Southwell to meet Southwell's Housing allocation without the Springfield Land (DPD ref SO/HO/2) which is prone to flooding (I also note that you have not included any of my flooding photographs or any of my substantiating documentation that was issued both hard copy and electronically with my Representation Forms).

Looking forward to your response.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Ainley