

Which part? Para/Policy/Plan	Legally compliant	Sound	Test of soundness	Examination	Why not legally compliant or unsound	Changes you consider necessary
<b>SP1</b>	Yes	No	No to all	No	There is no clear definition of what Sustainable Development means for East Staffordshire e.g. protection of fields and agricultural land. Sustainability needs to have a local determination	Local determination of the term “sustainable development is required. It should include villages, maintaining existing services and facilities within villages. A village is only sustainable if facilities are maintained, if not end up with commuter areas.
<b>SP2:</b>	No	No	No to all	Yes	This Policy does not accord with the Localism Act 2011 or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) both of which give local communities the right to determine how their community grows in terms of what type of development is permitted and where it should take place. The settlements have been created using the Settlement Hierarchy which is inaccurate and out of date as far as	The Settlement Hierarchy should be updated to take account of any inaccuracies in it and changes that have taken place since it was published. Account should be taken of the rights given to communities through the Localism Act 2011 and the NPPF

					<p>Rolleston on Dove is concerned. Despite several requests from both the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Development Plan Group, ESBC have refused to undertake a revision of the hierarchy. It is believed that a review of the Hierarchy will clearly demonstrate that Rolleston should not be labelled as a Tier 1 Strategic Village.</p> <p><b>List facilities lost/in dispute</b>  <b>Sentence to say existing facilities at capacity.</b>  <b>Sentence to state that Rolleston does not meet ESBC own definition of a strategic village.</b></p>	
<b>SP3</b>	Yes	No	No to all	No	<p>There appears to be issue with the housing requirement figures identified by ESBC as being required for the 2012-2031 plan and the Parish Council believe that these figures are too high. It is noted that ESBC acknowledge that in their 5 year calculations that there has been an under supply of 943 new dwellings. The local plan does not include the 943 shortfall meaning either the 5 year supply figures are inaccurate</p>	<p>The 5 year supply requirement needs amending to reflect the under supply.</p>

					or these new dwellings have been missed from the plan.	
<b>SP4</b>	No	No	No to all	Yes	<p>The pre submission local plan has made a strategic allocation of 100 houses for the village. Rolleston on Dove Parish Council do not accept that the village is a “strategic village” and have asked ESBC to revisit this status. There are several inaccuracies with the Settlement Hierarchy status which have not been addressed by ESBC. The Parish Council believes that it has the facilities/services of a Tier 2 and not Tier 1 village.</p> <p>25 houses have already been granted planning permission in Rolleston since the start of the plan period. This means that the whole windfall allowance has already been taken up. This means that one and a half years into a 19 year plan the village have already received all of their windfall allowance. This takes away Rolleston’s right to be able to determine the level of growth and where it takes place which is in conflict with the NPPF and Localism Act 2011.</p>	The settlement hierarchy should be revisited. In accord with the communities rights in the Localism Act and NPPF the village should be able to determine its own growth through the NHD plan process.
<b>SP5</b>	Yes	No	No to all	No	Outline planning permission has been granted for 18 hectares of employment land as part of the application Land South of Branston. There is no mention	The employment land south of Branston needs to be included in the plan.

					if this site in the plan.	
<b>SP8</b>	Yes	No	No to all	Yes	<p>Whilst the Parish Council support the not allowing development outside of development boundaries, they do not support the proposed modification to the development boundary of Rolleston on Dove.</p> <p>Evidence that the proposed modification to the development boundary is not acceptable has been obtained through the NHD plan process with a clear desire that the playing field should be returned to sports use.</p> <p>The Parish Council would however support modifications as indicated in the Neighbourhood development plan to include the preferred development sites.</p>	The development boundary for Rolleston on Dove to be modified to accord with the NHD plan and the proposed boundary change that includes the college field not to be modified.
<b>SP9</b>	Yes	Yes	No to all	No	<p>The Parish Council believes that Parish Councils in all parts of the Borough should be consulted on what infrastructure is required in their areas. They also believe that they should be consulted in the negotiating of Section 106 agreements.</p> <p>It is noted that no highways improvements are indicated within this plan despite proposals for almost 12,000 new homes.</p>	A structured plan of highway improvements and delivery should be included within the plan.

<b>SP10</b>	Yes	No	No to all	No	It is acknowledged that a new Senior School is required in the Burton upon Trent area within the next 4 to 5 years, but no site is located within the plan.	The new Senior School should be identified in the plan.
<b>SP20</b>	Yes	Yes	No to all	No	The policy aims to strengthen rural centres and increase the floor space selling comparison goods in strategic villages, but it is not clear where this additional floor space will be provided. All four of the strategic villages either have permission already granted or live applications which do not have any provision for a retail unit.	The part of the policy relating to Rural centres appears undeliverable and should therefore be removed.
<b>SP31</b>	Yes	Yes	No, Yes, No, Yes	Yes	The Parish Council fully support the principle of this policy, but do not feel that SSG1 provides sufficient protection against coalescence of Rolleston on Dove with Burton upon Trent.	The Parish Council believe that the area of land between Rolleston Road, Knowles Hill, Anslow Lane and Tutbury Road should be given the same full protection of green belt land.
<b>SP32</b>	Yes	Yes	No, Yes, No, Yes	Yes	This policy is fully supported as the Parish Council believe that with the increasing population more sports facilities will be needed. However the strategic allocation of the sports field for development in Rolleston is neither understood nor supported.	The strategic allocation attached to the Sports Field should be removed and the community given the opportunity to locate where growth should take place.
<b>Para 2.26</b>	Yes	No	No to all	No	The paragraph suggests that ESBC have actively worked with the Parish Council through either the neighbourhood planning process or directly. This is not	Proactive engagement with the Parish Council.

					true in case of Rolleston. It is understood that this is also an area of commonality with the other “strategic villages”.	
<b>Para 2.27</b>	Yes	No	No to all		It should be noted that whilst Tier 1 villages have been visited and assessments made, no engagement has been undertaken with the Parish Council or any other Tier 1 village.	Strategic allocations should be removed.
<b>Housing Trajectory</b>	Yes	No	No to all	No	ESBC proposed Local plan proposes actual number of dwellings to be delivered in the first 5 years of the plan period to be 3,431. This excludes any buffer to provide choice of sites. The recent Red House Farm appeal states that ESBC should provide 650 new dwellings per year, plus 943 under supply from previous years. This equates to 4,193 dwellings in the first 5 years of the plan. These figures do not include a 5% or 20% buffer requirement. With the figures proposed there will be a shortfall of housing within the first 5 year period of the plan.	The housing trajectory should be revised such that it facilitates sufficient new dwellings to provide an adequate 5 year supply of housing land.