

1. **Matter 3 - Housing** I refer to the Inspector's revised matters and issues for examination at hearings. **Item 11: Are the locations identified the most appropriate when considered against all reasonable alternatives?**

I have just discovered that the A612 is to be down-graded to a B road. As the plans show that the By-pass would feed onto the A612 surely it would not be considered suitable to feed it onto a B road. If this is so then the land set aside for the By-pass could be considered for development thus allowing So/Ho/2 to remain outside the Southwell Town boundary and kept as part of the countryside and not be developed.

I do not think that the District Council has considered all the alternatives fairly regarding the development of So/Ho/2.

Springfield land was considered to be Open Countryside until recently. Surely land specified as such should only be considered for development if there is no other land available. Would it not be short-sighted for this land to be developed at this stage when the By-pass land could be made available? As well as the By-pass land there is a site which was thought too small to be considered for development but which adjoins the larger site of So/Ho/6 and if this land was added to it and treated as a whole then it could provide a much larger number of dwellings than Newark & Sherwood have allocated. As, has been pointed out by various residents and Councillors, if the District Council are considering the building of affordable housing then the density of a number of the sites in Southwell seems to be unreasonably low and if this could be increased then it could also mean that the land So/Ho/2 previously Open Countryside could be retained as just that.

2. Time and again residents of Halloughton Road and Nottingham Road have pointed out and provided evidence of the problems of the drainage on So/Ho/2 Springfield land. We would have welcomed the opportunity to make our case to the decision-makers if they would have met us on site and we could have pointed out why we are so worried about this field being concreted over. The proof is there if only they would let us show them where to look. I presume that the Inspector will be too busy to take up an offer of meeting with me at my home so that I can show her the extent of the preventative measures in case of flooding that we have had to make to our property and this is only one property but there are others. I could show her where the water runs out onto Nottingham Road and where the pavement gets flooded so that pedestrians have to walk on the busy main road. I could show her a pipe that runs into the hedgerow alongside Nottingham Road which Nottingham County Council workmen have told me is to drain water off the Springfield and adjoining land and they confirmed that the water did not run off SO/HO/3. The general opinion seems to be that the flooding of Nottingham Road is from Potwell Dyke but this is not the case and we have photos to prove it and residents who live at the side of it confirm it.

With all the evidence we have provided to the District Council surely if they go ahead and put the site forward for development and it results in our land and property being damaged by flooding once again then we ought to be able to hold them responsible. We have warned them of the very possible consequences of their action and if they do not accept what we have said in spite of the proof we have provided then perhaps the Inspector could advise us what action we could take if flooding occurs and how we should proceed.