

Meeting Held Between ESBC, Rolleston on Dove Parish Council and Neighbourhood Development  
Steering Group  
Monday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2016 10-12, The Maltsters

**Attendees**

Cllr J Jessel ESBC (Chairperson)  
C O'Hare, N Perry, A Miller, S Khan (ESBC)  
Cllr B Gooding (Steering Group and Parish Council), Cllr Sanderson, J Bucknall (Parish Council)  
P Barnett , L Claber (Steering Group)

Cllr Jessel opened the meeting and introductions were made.

Cllr Sanderson gave a statement from the Parish Council in response to the SoS decision to allow outline permission for 100 homes on College Fields. This is attached.

Cllr Jessel responded that she understood the disappointment completely, and they are aware some developers are 'land banking' which means buying the land but not developing it, meaning that further sites have to be allocated to ensure the housing supply.

Mr Barnett stated that the Civic Trust, noted their anger and frustration that these houses will be imposed on the village.

The College Fields S106 is outlined in the outline planning application, and cannot now be amended. The wording of this is available on line, but Corinne will forward to the Clerk.

ESBC outlined three options for the Neighbourhood Development Plan:

- a. Hold a consultation with residents following SoS decision. Amend / redraft the current examined plan, consult with local planners (and the local community, statutory consultees etc...) and re-submit. This would need to conform to the ESBC Local Plan.
- b. Receive a decision statement based on the current examined plan, which would obviously say it does not conform to the Local Plan, then re-write the plan, consult with residents and re-submit. This would effectively kill the Neighbourhood Plan.  
Or
- c. Inform ESBC that we do not intend to submit a plan, then Receive a decision statement.

ESBC currently have 17 Neighbourhood Plans in place and are keen for Rolleston to have a plan in place.

Rolleston representatives noted that if the Neighbourhood Plan had gone to Referendum sooner it would not be non-compliant.

ESBC reps stated that as the number of houses needs amending, and the amount of time that has passed since the Neighbourhood Plan was written, the plan will need to go back to Residents:

100 houses on College Fields, plus 25 windfall (not a capped maximum) will need to be in the plan (the table of houses and the allocation policies), plus the policy on the review period will need to be either re-worked or removed. ESBC took legal advice on this policy and it needs to be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timebound).

ESBC representatives noted that there is now a much clearer basis on which to write a Neighbourhood

**Comment [c1]:** Not sure I agree with this statement: ESBC issuing a decision statement would mean that the PC/SG could re-draft the plan as in option A and go to re-consultation. What it would do is officially say that the plan as examined does not meet the basic conditions. In practice much of the examined plan is still valid, as we discussed at the meeting.

**Comment [c2]:** As briefly discussed at the meeting the Rolleston Plan does not need to talk about housing numbers, as these are set by ESBC but other policies on design/density/inside\_outside settlement boundary policies could be drafted.

Plan. However Rolleston reps pointed out that it seems as if ESBC should write the NP themselves. Other policies such as parking policies, green spaces etc can be included – the plan is not just necessarily about housing numbers.

Timescales were discussed. Ms O'Hare shared a simple project plan which showed it could take between 12-16 months once the NP is drafted to get signed off. NPs no longer need a final sign off at Cabinet Level, Cllr Jessel signs them all off **after Examination and Referendum** now.

Rolleston reps asked what protection the ESBC Local Plan gives the village.

The New Local Plan affords the village some protection from development, this is based on the village boundary. As ESBC currently have a defensible five year land supply, any development outside the village boundary would be presumed to not be permitted, whilst anything inside the boundary could be and would need to be fought in the usual ways. If the five year supply runs out then a developer could go for a site outside of the boundary. Discussion on windfall developments being 25 for the period of the local plan 2012 – 2031 was a figurative figure and following a decision by a planning Inspector of the Local Plan could not be considered to be a capped figure.

A Neighbourhood Plan holds some weight once it has been examined.

Front-runner Grant – there is still **£7425.95** left in this grant (having spent **£12,574.05** so far) for us to draw on. We were also advised on other source(s) of funding that may be available from 'locality' mycommunity.org – either direct support from AECOM (even face to face) or up to £9k of grant funding, and **AECOM Nationwide Planning Consultancy may help with direct support up to £6k further funding for 'complex' issues/plans.**

In terms of timescales it could take between 12-16 months from the draft plan stage to get signed off by ESBC. We would have to re-consult with villagers. The stages are outlined in the enclosed table.

ESBC have to give support for things such as evidence, statistics, figures and mapping (and are keen to do so).

#### Hall Farm Church Road

Owners of Hall Farm Church Road have requested that their property is included within the village boundary. As it is part of the old Rolleston Hall estate they consider this a reasonable request. Currently the house is within the boundary and the garden is outside. ESBC reps pointed out that this is frequently the case throughout the district for properties on the fringe of villages. The village boundary could potentially be amended on re-draft of the NP. ESBC said unofficially that this would not be supported by them, and the PC should think carefully before amending the boundary as it may impact on other areas of the village and potentially encourage further applications for 'garden grabbing'.

The meeting concluded at 11.40.

## **Cllr Sanderson Statement**

Rolleston residents and the PC were extremely disappointed with the outcome of the decision by the Secretary of State, and for many it is an example of how little control ordinary people have on their local environment and has created mistrust of the localism and Neighbourhood planning process. We were hoping the case that had been made was to be successful, but things worked against us. Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP and SoS is the third SoS to be involved in the decision. This decision in our opinion shows that the Localism Act of 2010 has not supported the wishes of Rolleston on Dove residents. We were a front runner of Parish Councils in attempting to establish our Neighbourhood Plan but feel we have been thwarted in our endeavours, with villages starting later now having ratified plans. Our headwinds have been multiple but our perceived lack of support by Planning Officers in the past particularly related to the calculation method of determining the number of houses, has hindered our progression. We have also in our opinion suffered manipulation of the village status in making it a Tier 1 village by the strategic placing of the centre of the village to a point guaranteed to include the maximum number of facilities to increase our score. This point bears no resemblance to the operational centre of the village as recognised by the residents. Several facilities included no longer exist – Brookhouse Hotel closed and is believed to be about to be subjected to a planning application for conversion to flats with additional housing in its grounds, the Methodist Church has been closed for several years and currently on the market, and a florist shop was converted to residential!

Past discussions with Planning Officers seem to have been predetermined and co-ordinated to ensure Burton College gets the highest financial benefit from the land which they were gifted, with little or no benefit to the village.

However, with the SoS decision we have to be realistic and endeavour to move forward with the planners and councillors of ESBC and remember the obligations we have to all our stakeholders: residents, members, borough and county councils, neighbouring villages, businesses and community groups and more. The nature of the work we do means we will not be able to satisfy everyone's often differing interests, but obliges us to act fairly, consistently and with due diligence and awareness of the responsibility we hold.

We are keen to understand what S106 agreements can be negotiated to benefit Rolleston on Dove? We are concerned that some options tabled may implicate long term management costs, and are keen to ensure any development with these funds are effective in delivering value to the village and are affordable to run, as well as sustainable. Previous discussions have suggested £150k for playing field changing rooms – but what would costs for example of providing services to the site be?, ongoing security etc. We need the best options we can have for the village, whether it would be for the school, developing a health centre or some other benefit.