



Matter 5/Representor 66/RPS for Harworth Estates

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement sets out the responses of Harworth Estates to the Inspectors' Matters and Issues for Examination at Hearings with respect to the Newark and Sherwood Allocation and Development Management Development Plan Document.
- 1.2 This statement therefore provides comments in response to the questions and issues raised by the Inspector and elaborates upon the representations previously raised during public consultation and in our responses to those documents.

2. Matter 5 – Site Specific Issues

Sherwood Area

Inspectors Question 24:

“Do the policies include adequate and appropriate safeguards with regard to the potential effects of development on flooding, biodiversity and local amenity? Has satisfactory provision been made in respect of transport and other infrastructure requirements?”

- 2.1 No comment.

Inspectors Question 25:

“Are the detailed requirements for mixed use and employment sites, including retail uses, clear and justified and will they ensure delivery within the planned timescale?”

- 2.2 The requirements for site BI/MU/1 at Bilsthorpe clearly identify that the site is allocated for 75 dwellings and retail development. In combination with ADM policy DM11 it is clear that the retail element of the allocation is for *‘new and enhanced convenience retail development that serves the community and is consistent with its size and function.’* No further clarification is considered necessary.

- 2.3 The remaining requirements are clear and justified in the context of the site.

Inspectors Question 26:

“Are the housing sites in Ollerton and Boughton deliverable given the requirements of the Core Strategy policies relating to affordable housing and the development management policies set out in the Plan?”

- 2.4 No comment.

Mansfield Fringe Area

Inspectors Question 27:

“Do the policies include adequate and appropriate safeguards with regard to the potential effects of development on the Green Belt, biodiversity, historic environment and flooding? Has satisfactory provision been made in respect of transport and other infrastructure requirements?”

- 2.5 The major environmental constraint facing the MFA is the potential for a pSPA/SPA designation which would invoke the Habitats Regulations and the need for Appropriate Assessment. The presence of nightjar and woodlark populations on the proposed allocated sites RA/E/1 and CI/MU1 is not known owing to a lack of survey information. Even if the proposed sites do not directly have an adverse impact on the habitats they may have indirect effects, especially in combination with other plans and projects. Any adverse effects would need mitigation. The proposed employment allocations RA/E/1 and CI/MU/1 would not be able to create habitats to offset any harm. This is one of the Council’s reasons why the former Rufford Colliery was considered to be unsuitable for development, despite the fact that it is the only site within the MFA with sufficient land to successfully offset any harm.
- 2.6 Notwithstanding this, there is no pSPA/SPA designation to have account of at the present time, and there may never be. In these circumstances, whilst policy DM7 covers the protection of European sites and the Habitat Regulations would apply to the plan and any future planning applications, given the Council’s concerns it would

be sensible to highlight the issues and the potential need to comply with these requirements for the policies relating to all proposed allocations in the MFA.

Inspector Question 28:

“Are the housing sites deliverable given the requirements of the Core strategy policies relating to affordable housing and the development management policies set out in the Plan? Is the amount and type of retail/employment development justified and deliverable?”

- 2.7 With respect to the housing allocations proposed by the Council, the Council’s own viability assessments show that none of the sites in the MFA would be viable in the first years. The Council rely on an approach that the sites would nonetheless be viable if the landowner/developer was to take less return. This may be so, but there is level to which this remains true. No evidence is put forward by the council which identifies this level for each site (and each site will be different). No determination can be reached, therefore, as to whether the level of return which would see the sites developed and provide affordable housing which is suggested, would be realistically accepted by the landowner/developer. No determination can therefore be reached as to whether the sites are developable.
- 2.8 Through our Representations we have demonstrated that the former Rufford Colliery site is the most appropriate site for employment within the MFA, and have advocated a more appropriate strategy for the MFA as whole. This strategy would allocate 12Ha of employment at the former Rufford Colliery in recognition of it being the most appropriate employment site within the MFA; would allocate site RAE/1 for housing rather than employment instead of site RA/H0/2 in recognition of its position within the settlement boundary and not being within the green belt, and not being viable for employment; and would allocate less employment at CI/MU/1 in recognition that it is not the most appropriate employment site and the additional housing provision would assist it offset the sites abnormal costs making it more deliverable.
- 2.9 The strategy proposed by the Council proposes to allocate employment on sites which are less appropriate for employment than the former Rufford Colliery site and less likely to deliver employment. The many advantages of the former Rufford Colliery site are set out in full in our Representations (Appendix 1), and Hearing



Statements, and evidence from Savills (Appendix 2) and BWB (Appendix 3). Key to the superiority of the former Rufford Colliery site is its superior access to the strategic highway network and its potential to deliver the full range of employment uses responding to the markets needs in a unique setting more attractive to the market, with the potential to provide CHP, rail access, and biodiversity and landscape enhancements.

2.10 In contrast, with respect to deliverability, evidence from Savills at Appendix X shows that:

- The proposed site for employment at RA/E/1 is not viable, and will not therefore be delivered
- The proposed level of employment at CI/MU1 is not viable, and will not therefore be delivered
- The development of the former Rufford Colliery for 12Ha of employment would be viable, and as it is available and suitable for employment would be delivered
- Site RA/E/1 would be viably developed with affordable housing and providing a level of return to the land owner and developer that would see the site come forward
- Site CI/MU/1 would be viably developed if the level of employment was reduced to 5.5 Ha and the quantum of dwellings provided increased by 100 to 220. This alternative would be likely to provide affordable housing and a return to the landowner/developer that would lead to the site being delivered

2.10 We therefore conclude that the alternative strategy we advocate should is viable, and the most appropriate strategy for the MFA, and is therefore deliverable and should be adopted by the ADM.



Inspectors Question 29:

“Have the policies for Blidworth been prepared positively in terms of the duty to cooperate with neighbouring planning authorities and is this on-going. How do the policies relate to plans and strategies of neighbouring local authorities?”

2.X No comment.