

Matter 2 – 5

With regard to representations which have been made in respect of the site of the former Clipstone Colliery Complex that forms the subject of Policy CL/MU/1 and more especially the element of it which indicates the site will accommodate around 120 dwellings it is not considered that this has yet been demonstrated to be viable. That is to say, as previously indicated, the suitability and viability of this site to accommodate housing and more particularly the type of larger family housing which is specifically sought in Clipstone will be very directly related to the ongoing question of whether or not the listed headstocks can be removed. As this issue is still not yet resolved and there does not appear to be any indication that this is likely to occur in the foreseeable future there have to be considerable doubts over the question of whether or not housing on this site is viable and hence deliverable. Consequently in the recent circumstances whereby all of the required future housing for Clipstone is directed to this site including the express requirement for larger family homes, to which there is likely to be market reluctance from the house building industry there are serious doubts over the deliverability of this element of the proposed development on this site.

A different consideration arises under this issue in terms of the site which forms the subject of Policy ED/Ho/2 on Mansfield Road Clipstone in so far as the policy refers to the need for a thorough archaeological evaluation of this site due to the previously identified potential interest of this nature affecting it. That exercise may affect the potential of some or this entire site to accommodate housing development and therefore unless and until it has been completed there are serious questions over its deliverability and hence it is inappropriate for it to continue to be identified as an allocation.

Matter 2 – 6

In respect of the site which forms the subject of policy CL/MU/1 in Clipstone and the more generalised policies relating to the settlement, as the Settlement Framework Boundary has not been adjusted because the whole of this site already falls within it due to its former use there is no flexibility to cope with the subsequent emergence of any factors which might render it to be undeliverable for the envisaged purposes. This is because those purposes include the accommodation of all of the proposed development for the settlement on this site and if this proves to be undeliverable there will be no scope to allow any other sites to be developed as an alternative because all of those which have otherwise been determined to be suitable, particularly this objector's site which was previously identified as CI/AS/1 to the north of Woodland Close, Clipstone, would fall outside of the settlement framework boundary. In these circumstances it is clearly necessary to introduce sufficient flexibility to cope with changes which would render the currently allocated sites to be undeliverable in whole or in part. Ironically in this respect at the earlier stage of preparation of this DPD (Options Report) that was reported in the Spring of 2012, in the light of representations both from English Heritage and Nottinghamshire County Council to the effect that the likelihood is that the listed headstocks will remain the authority itself was caused to question the deliverability of all of the then anticipated housing at this location. Consequently it was stated that further work would be required to clarify

whether all of the housing on this site was deliverable and if that is not possible, there would be need to consider allocating other sites to address any shortfall and as necessary amending the proposed settlement boundary accordingly. Notwithstanding this self questioning the authority simply proceeded to allocate even more housing to this site despite the fact that at the same time it did not introduce any flexibility to cope with changes to sites which might render them undeliverable for their envisaged purposes, by, for instance proposing changes to the Settlement Boundary Framework to allow other alternative sites to come forward.

The same situation applies to site ED/Ho/2 in Edwinstowe because although there are doubts over its deliverability the Settlement Framework Boundary has not been adjusted to allow for any other alternative sites to be developed instead of it. It has previously been submitted that the settlement framework boundary does need to be adjusted to allow more development on the site which forms the subject of policy ED/Ho/1 should all or part of the Mansfield Road, Edwinstowe site prove to be undeliverable and it is considered that this is necessary in order to build sufficient flexibility into the Plan to cope with the eventuality of allocated sites proving to be undeliverable.