

# **Rolleston on Dove Parish Council**

## **COLLEGE SITE OBJECTIONS**

### **Premature**

ESBC are in the process of producing their Local Plan, Rolleston on Dove Parish Council are in the process of compiling their Neighbourhood Development Plan both of which would be adversely affected if such a large development were permitted. This application shows total disregard for the Localism Bill

### **Contra to Policy NE1**

Saved Policy NE1 in ESBC existing Local Plan requires all development to be within existing development boundaries which are clearly defined unless special circumstances prevail. This proposed development is totally outside Rolleston's development boundary and there are no special circumstances.

### **Size of Development**

Last year ESBC consulted on their Pre Draft Publication Strategic Options. Within this document was a breakdown as to where they were planning for development to provide the 13,000 new homes identified by the Regional Spatial Strategy. 450 of these new homes were allocated to the five Strategic Villages and since 224 homes have already received planning permission on the Burton Road site in Tutbury the other 4 Strategic Villages could be expected to accommodate 57 new homes each. The new Local Plan covers the period from 2006 to 2031 and since there have been 31 house completions or planning permissions granted in Rolleston since 2006 Rolleston could reasonably expect to accommodate a further 26 new homes during the next 19 years.

### **Flooding**

This site is responsible for surface water flooding in Meadow View. On 29<sup>th</sup> April 2012 surface water was seen to flow off this site on to the Public Open Space provided as part of the Westbury estate, from there this water flowed on to Meadow View Open Space and then into the garden of 23 Meadow View. The proposed development acknowledges that because of all the impervious surfaces, roads roofs drives etc, there will be a lot of additional surface water to deal with as it will not be absorbed into the ground. To resolve this situation they plan to create a lake exactly where the existing flooding problem exists. This can only exacerbate an already unacceptable situation.

### **Visual Intrusion**

This proposed development will be highly visible from Craythorne Road as it is being built on the highest ground around. The Village Design Statement has long advocated that there should be no development on the skyline and that is exactly what is proposed. To suggest that deciduous trees will form a screen is inaccurate and misleading.

### **No Planning Gain for Village**

The college have suggested that they will provide a sum of £50,000 to provide play equipment, but there is no guarantee that the play equipment will be provided in Rolleston, remember that last time they took away sporting and other facilities to build the Westbury estate and built a new sports hall in Shobnall, nor has there been any consultation with the Parish Council to establish if in fact they want any more play equipment. Then there is the £50,000 provided to maintain the Public Open Space connected to the development. Again there have been no discussions with the Parish Council on this matter and the truth is that the money will be needed to maintain the open space forever so

this is not a windfall, bonus or generous donation it is a necessary sum of money to fulfil a specific job.

### **Affordable Housing**

The college have stated that they are not proposing to include any affordable housing in their development because it will reduce the value of the land by one third and that by spending all of the money received for the sale of the land on capital projects at the college they should be considered a “special case” ESBC employed Midland Rural Housing in 2008 to undertake a survey of housing need in Rolleston. This survey demonstrated a need for 9 affordable/shared ownership houses. Any proposed development of 25 dwellings, or more, in East Staffordshire should include 30% of affordable housing or negotiate a commuted sum with ESBC to facilitate the provision of affordable housing in central Burton. There is no option to claim that the applicant is a special case and that these conditions should not apply to them.

### **Access Roads**

According to the application the access roads to the proposed site have been designed to accommodate the expected traffic created by the proposed development. How do they know? When the college sold the site of the former campus it had outline planning permission for 60 houses. Westbury then redesigned the site and obtained planning permission and built 89 houses. You do not have to be a highway engineer to see that with the amount of on road parking added to such poorly laid out roads the access to the proposal is totally unsuited to commercial vehicles transporting building materials to the site etc.

### **Range of House Types**

It is disappointing that the range of housing proposed does not include bungalows.

### **Contradictory Drawings**

When the “Concept” drawing is compared with the “Housing Mix” drawing it is surprising to note that the tree layouts are totally different. The “Concept” drawing indicates rows of trees lining the roads running north south, but the “Housing Mix” drawing omits these trees because there is not enough room in the front gardens of the houses to plant trees. Again the trees in the back gardens disappear from one drawing to the other. The truth probably is that the trees will disappear because the gardens are not large enough to accommodate trees.

### **5 Year Supply**

The recently enacted National Planning Policy Framework requires all local authorities to have 5.05 years supply of deliverable housing sites available at any one time. ESBC say they are “comfortable” with their position at the moment. If ESBC can show a 5.05 year supply of housing land they do not have to permit any planning application that is on any other land.

### **Brownfield/Greenfield Release Policy**

ESBC established a Policy concerning the release of Brownfield/Greenfield land last year, this policy details how planning applications are determined when there is or is not a five year supply of housing land. This policy states if the council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites the following conditions apply ***“Greenfield sites for housing will not be permitted, unless there are exceptional circumstances. These circumstances are likely to be either (i) a rural ‘exception site’ for 100% affordable housing, in accordance with Local Plan Policy H13 para. 30, or (ii) a large strategic Greenfield site meeting the tests set out in paras 5 and 6(a-j) below and therefore where there are overwhelming reasons to set aside the ‘Brownfield first’ principle”*** The proposal does not have any such reasons therefore it does not satisfy this requirement.

## **Highways**

The conclusion of the Transport Assessment is *“In conclusion, it is recommended that SCC highways department approve this development as access to the site is safe and suitable for all people and the development will not lead to a significant detrimental effect on the local highway network”* They reach this conclusion by assuming most of the new residents will walk, cycle or use public transport. The truth is that this site is more than 2 kilometres from the shops, unless you are a bird, which means people using the shops will drive there making the existing parking problems worse.

## **Public Open Space**

It is very disappointing that the college think that they can call an area designed to hold surface water as Public Open Space. The reality is that the college are offering virtually no Public Open Space other than a narrow strip along the boundary of the site. Any site over a certain size is obligated to provide a certain amount of open space and this proposal fails to do this.

## **Preferred Use of College Field**

The proposed site was the best sports field in the area. It had herringbone land drainage pipes laid and could facilitate several sports at the same time. When the Westbury estate was built on the former college campus it is claimed that the college provided alternative sports facilities at Shobnall. The truth is a sports hall was built; there were no new sports pitches created. Rolleston lost the sports field, a swimming pool and a number of tennis courts. This did not and still does not seem equitable. The playing fields should be returned to the purpose they were originally compulsorily purchased for which was a sports field.

The college claim that the site is not used. This is not true it is used by literally hundreds of local residents which is clearly illustrated by the footpaths they have created.

The college claim that the site is surplus to requirements. The truth is the college have refused a number of written requests to use the sports field for sporting activities from different organisations claiming that if they allowed sport to be played on it then their ability to sell it at a future date would be compromised.

Anyone wishing to object to this application should write to:

James Malkin  
Planning Delivery  
ESBC  
The Maltsters  
Wetmore Road  
Burton on Trent  
Staffordshire  
DE14 1LS

e-mail; [james.malkin@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk](mailto:james.malkin@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk)

**Please quote ref; P/2012/00636 and submit comments by 29<sup>th</sup> June 2012**