

Matter 3 – 9

In respect of site CI/MU/1 because of the environmental constraint of the continued existence of the listed headstocks it has not been demonstrated that the housing element of this proposal is viable and deliverable for the first 5 years. All of the indications are that these are likely to remain, certainly for the foreseeable future, and therefore the continued presence would generate market reluctance to the development of housing on this site and certainly to the type of 4 bedroom detached family housing that the authority is specifically seeking in Clipstone.

Similarly, due to the environmental constraint of the possible archaeological interest of site ED/Ho/2 in Edwinstowe it has not been demonstrated that housing on this site would be viable or deliverable in the first 5 years. Indeed this could place a too great constraint on the developable area of the site which would be available such that it would not be viable to undertake at all.

Matter 3 – 10

The alternative proposal which has been put forward for Clipstone ie the positive allocation of the site previously referenced CI/AS/1 is appropriate and deliverable. It has been the subject of a sustainability appraisal exercise which is compatible with that for the Plan because it was first of all examined through the SHLAA exercise and subsequently at each of the relevant stages of the preparation of this DPD up until the Publication Stage when it was omitted. On all of the occasions on which its appropriateness in sustainability and all related terms was examined it was concluded to be appropriate and certainly deliverable, as it is in the single ownership of a party willing to dispose of it for development at an early date. The sole point of resistance to it has been the need for a change to the Settlement Framework Boundary by way of this DPD in order to enable it to be identified and allocated for development.

In respect of site ED/Ho/1 in Edwinstowe which is under the control of this objector, obviously it has been assessed in sustainability terms at all of the appropriate stages such that it has been allocated because it is correctly concluded to be appropriate and deliverable. Accordingly, the proposed extension to it to compensate for site ED/Ho/2 which is not considered to have been demonstrated to be deliverable must equally be concluded to be appropriate and deliverable.

In this respect the relevant assessments through the course of preparation of the SHLAA and DPD have not been appended because they are anticipated to be part of the Core Strategy Document/Evidence Base but can be supplied if necessary.

Matter 3 – 11

For the reasons which have been given more fully in the earlier main representations at this stage it is not considered that site CL/MU/1 is the most appropriate location to accommodate all of the proposed housing for Clipstone, and particularly the required 4 bedroom detached houses as it is not an appropriate site for this form of development. The reasonable alternative of site CL/AS/1 which has been put forward is considered to be more appropriate.

Similarly, site ED/Ho/2 is not considered to be the most appropriate location when considered against all reasonable alternatives for the reasons which have been explained more fully in the earlier reorientations. The reasonable alternative of removing the housing allocation for that site and incorporating it as an extension to site ED/Ho/1 which has been put forward is considered to be more appropriate.