

ROLLESTON ON DOVE PARISH COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MONDAY 27TH JANUARY 2014**

PRESENT

Cllr J Toon, Chairman
Cllr S Adams
Cllr S Anderson
Cllr R Davies
Cllr S Sanderson
Cllr B Toon
Cllr C Warren
Cllr Wyatt
Mrs H. Light, Clerk

Ten members of the public were in attendance.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Simnett and Cllr Haywood.

2. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS:-

Members commented on the following applications:-

P/2013/01458 Erection of 11 dwellings and formation of access, Apple Acres, 14 Knowles Hill

Members of Rolleston on Dove Parish Council recognise that this site was a preferred site identified for development within the Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is however noted that the proposals differ significantly from the aspirations for the site development and the policies as set out in the NHD plan.

Members would like to register their concerns with the following details within the proposals:-

- The proposed type of housing does not match the aspiration of the NHD plan which was for retirement type dwellings.
- The site is overdeveloped and is of high density.
- The application is premature.
- Members are concerned about the proposed loss of mature trees.
- The site proposes insufficient parking with only on road parking available to visitors.
- Plot 11 appears to close to the adjacent wall.
- Members are concerned about loss of light to the neighbouring property.
- Part of the proposed development site is prone to flooding
- Insufficient amenity/public open space

P/2013/01406 Outline application with all matters reserved except access, for a mixed use development including up to 500 dwellings, local centre providing up to 500sq metres of floor space or public house together with associated car parking and servicing, specialist care housing, public open space, structural landscaping and provision of drainage, and internal highway network to include the provision of access junctions to the A511 Tutbury Road and Rolleston Road with public realm works to Tutbury Road to replace the existing traffic lights with a roundabout and realignment of Harehedge Lane and formation of two mini roundabouts together with construction of off-site parking, Glenville Farm, Tutbury Road.

Members strongly object to this application and would urge that the application is refused for the reasons detailed below:-

- The proposed development has a significant impact on Rolleston, Stretton, Outwoods and Horninglow
- 25% of the housing proposed is within Rolleston yet no attempt has been made to consult with the Parish Council and no consideration has been given to the NHD plan which has passed examination with a recommendation for it subject to some minor modifications proceed to referendum.
- The application is premature.

- Members are extremely concerned that the development will lead to the coalescence of Rolleston with surrounding villages and Burton with is against saved policy NE1.
- 25% of the proposed houses are within the Strategic Green gap as identified within ESBC emerging local plan.
- The proposed affordable housing within the site is not integrated which is against Strategic Policy 17 and a requirement within the urban design compendium
- Members are concerned about the loss of agricultural/farming land
- There was no openness in the Public consultation evenings and no consideration has been given to the representations made during the initial consultations undertaken by First City.
- The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the existing services/facilities within the village which are close to capacity.
- Members have a lack of confidence in the Highways details as follows:-
- Impact from other adjacent developments has not been taken into consideration
- There is no overall highways plan for East Staffs.
- Ingress/Egress is adjacent to school slip road which poses a potentially hazardous situation.
- Pressure on Harehedge lane
- The traffic surveys do not appear to have taken into consideration, any traffic movements through the village – e.g. Beacon Road, Station Road to A38

Cllr Davies proposed, Cllr Adams seconded and it was moved that the Parish Council should also write and express their concerns to Staffordshire County Council Highways department.

The Chairman moved that due to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted the public and press be excluded from the duration of the meeting.

3. TO CONSIDER REPRESENTATION FOR THE COLLEGE APPEAL (Clerks report item 6)

Mr Anderson declared a prejudicial interest and did not participate in the votes.

It was discussed that the results from the NHD plan clearly indicated that the village did not support one large development and for this reason, the Parish Council should take the necessary steps to defend the forthcoming appeal.

Members considered the quotation received from Mr Bowden and members were advised that as the Public Inquiry had been set at four days, his quotation would need to be brought in line to reflect this. The covering letter received from Mr Bowden was also considered. Cllr Sanderson proposed, Cllr Wyatt seconded and it was moved on a unanimous vote that to strengthen the case the option of Mr Bowden lone working at the appeal should be eliminated.

It was agreed that the clerk should speak to Mr Bowden to see what he would recommend in terms of support of additional support at the appeal and if he could recommend anyone to work with. In addition the clerk was asked to raise the following questions with Mr Bowden:- In an ideal situation what would he recommend in terms of representation? Is anyone other than a Barrister able to ask a question? What is the benefit of Barrister vs. planner?

It was agreed not to make direct media contact and any press enquiries should be addressed to the clerk.

Cllr Wyatt proposed, Cllr Sanderson seconded and it was unanimously moved that the Parish Council agree allocate a maximum expenditure of £7,000 to defend it's position, with a proportion of the expenditure to come out of the Parish Councils reserves to allow for the planned capital expenditure to still be available for the 2014/2015 financial year.

It was agreed that as both the Parish Council and the Borough Council were defending the appeal, that the Parish Council should ask ESBC for access to their Barrister.

Cllr Davies proposed, Cllr Adams seconded and it was moved on a unanimous vote that the Parish Council write to ESBC and re-iterate their concerns that as the witnesses they have appointed to defend the appeal were both in favour of the development the Parish Council do not therefore feel that they are in a strong position to defend the appeal and that more appropriate representatives should be appointed.

CHAIRMAN