

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
1	30/04/2018	Rolleston Village Webmaster	Only taken a quick look at the document and think I only found one of the maps included Meadow Fields. Others seemed already out of date?	Noted	No update						
2	30/04/2018	Rolleston Village Webmaster	I know many like me found it odd to see some of the roads in the Westbury Estate named as Streets. Until that development Rolleston did not have any Streets so it is doubly unfortunate that one of the flooding pictures mentions Station Street rather than Road (p35).	Agreed	Yes						
3	30/04/2018	Rolleston Village Webmaster	Have also spotted p34 refers to School Road (rather than Lane?).	Agreed	Yes						
4	01/05/2018	Resident	I am puzzled by a reference to the " Island" at Shotwood Close---and I am not alone! (this is in the new NP)....could you please explain the terminology	Delete word 'island'	Yes						
5	14/05/2018	resident	The number 1 bus service only runs Monday to Friday, NOT SATURDAY.	p16 Agreed	Yes						
6	14/05/2018	resident	The discussion on page ?? refers to a Strategic Area on the map on page 15. There is no such area marked on the map though Stuart Sanderson told me it was the College Field/Sports Field.	p15 1st bullet pt.	Yes p15 add as 'sports field'						
7	09/05/2018	Planning Central/Sport England	Should reflect National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paras. 73 & 74	Noted	No						
8	09/05/2018	Planning Central/Sport England	Be aware of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and guidance document	Noted	No						
9	03/05/2018	National Grid	National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets	Noted	No						
10	03/05/2018	National Grid	National Grid has identified that it has no record of high voltage electricity assets, high pressure gas lines or National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate or High Pressure Apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	Noted	No						
11	03/05/2018	National Grid	Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect infrastructure.	Noted	No						
12	18/05/2018	Draycott in the Clay Borough Council	Draycott in the Clay Parish Councillors send their thanks to RoD Parish Council for sending through the NDP. They have no comments except to wish all the best with the consultation.	Noted	No						
13	19/05/2018	NDP steering group	Paras 5.9 and 5.10 are duplicated	Corrected	Yes						
14	19/05/2018	resident	p11 why is Lawns date out of sequence?	Corrected	Yes						
15	19/05/2018	resident	section 4.19(4.18?) not true? Since 1981 population has fallen but 250 house built to no effect.	Noted	No						
16	19/05/2018	resident	Policy OS1; Why no inclusion of Elizabeth Avenue or Craythorne?	Not designated green spaces	No						
17	19/05/2018	resident	9.8 when have the public met at the Clerk's house?	changed to 'have taken place'	Yes						
18	19/05/2018	resident	Thank you to all involved for the hard work put into the plan.	Noted	No						
19	19/05/2018	NDP steering group	p11,12 ; Fig.3 Housing Growth date order issues	Agreed	Yes						
20	23/05/2018	resident	I hereby request immediate withdrawal and correction of the proposed NDP as it is misleading and may cause or encourage trespass on the above property (plantation by the old swimming pool) with potential consequential damage to property and people. It may also cause loss in market value of my property.	see below							
21	23/05/2018	Coal Authority	Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.	Noted	No						
22	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	see emailed letter; Figure 2 · Entry "April 2012" was a presentation at The Craythorne by Burton and South Derbyshire College detailing their proposals for the College Field. It was nothing to do with the NDP · Entry "Aug/Sept 2012" what is the relevance of "2015 Neighbourhood Development Plan draft submitted for review" · Entry" March 2013" was the end of the six week parish council consultation period not ESBC's formal consultation. · Propose new entry July 2013 draft Neighbourhood Development Plan submitted to ESBC for formal six weeks consultation period Propose new entry October 2013 independent examiner reports that subject to minor modifications the Neighbourhood Development Plan should be put to a referendum	Noted	No						
23			Paragraph 5.3 Derby is a "city" not a town most importantly the buses connect Rolleston on Dove with Burton upon Trent.	Agreed	Yes						
24			Figure 6 this table infers that the V1 does not run on Saturdays when it does	Agreed	Yes						
25	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	Figures 7, 8, 9 & 10 These illustrations show road junctions that have limited visibility. It could be argued that the junction of the road with no name and Station Road should also be included. The road with no name is the road between School Lane and Chapel Lane. Paragraph numbers 5.9 and 5.10 have been duplicated this means that paragraphs numbered 5.9 to 5.22 need re-numbering. see emailed letter; Figure 8.2 This is the junction of Station Road and Chapel Lane not School Lane see emailed letter; Para. 6.4 Add play areas at Meadow View and two areas on the Westbury Estate	Noted	No						
				Agreed	Yes						
				Agreed	Yes						
				Noted	Added 'Forest School St'						
26	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	Figure 13 · Area 8 in Shotwood Close unless there is new evidence to show this is a Local Green Space requiring protection this is a mistake. This land was considered the most favourable site to develop in the public consultations undertaken in August/September 2012. · There are three areas marked 9 one is correctly called Twentylands Island the others should be called Shotwood Close Public Open Space and Beacon Drive Verges. · Area 10 only indicates one cricket pitch when there are two, this is misleading.	Noted	No	If it not a strategic site, has extant planning or allocated in the Local Plan then it can remain as a LGS.	noted no change				
				Noted	Yes						
				Noted	No	If this is the case you should amend the description accordingly.	wording and map amended				
			LGS8 Shotwood Close Public Open Space This is incorrectly titled Shotwood Close Island	Noted	Yes						
			LGS10 Beacon Drive Verges This is incorrectly titled Beacon Drive Island.	Noted	Yes						
			LGS11 Cricket Club and pitches · The plan does not show the whole area that is being considered so is fairly meaningless.	Noted	No	Make clear in the description why the area is chosen to avoid confusion.	wording and map amended				

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text should read "These very well maintained pitches and pavilion are at the entrance to the village also Looking outwards from the pitches illustrates the attractive aspect of a river plain. 	Noted	Yes						
			see emailed letter; Figure 15. Flooding The heading to this photograph should read "Junction of Chapel Lane and School Lane 13th March 2018, not School Road.	Noted	Yes						
			see emailed letter; Figure 18 Flooding The heading on this photograph should read "Station Road July 2012 not Station Street	Noted	Yes						
27	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Policy H1: Housing Requirements</p> <p>The first and third bullet points are unnecessary as the second bullet point covers all eventualities regarding location.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.14 Local Plan reference should read ("p136. Adopted Local Plan, 2012 - 2031 Planning for Change. Adopted 15th October 2015") not 2013.</p> <p>Policy D1: Green Infrastructure Should the last line of this Policy read - "Off site contributions to open space and green infrastructure should be used in the neighbourhood area"? not On site contributions etc.</p>	Noted	No						
			<p>Paragraph 8.14 Local Plan reference should read ("p136. Adopted Local Plan, 2012 - 2031 Planning for Change. Adopted 15th October 2015") not 2013.</p>	Noted	Yes						
			<p>Policy D1: Green Infrastructure Should the last line of this Policy read - "Off site contributions to open space and green infrastructure should be used in the neighbourhood area"? not On site contributions etc.</p>	Noted but is correct	No						
28	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Policy D1: Design of New Development</p> <p>Second bullet point should read "complement and integrate with the local surroundings in terms of scale, height, massing, spacing and set back from street frontages" not Complement and "integrating" etc.</p> <p>Eighth bullet point should read "retain existing front hedges and trees and design boundary treatment etc. not "designing" boundary treatment.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.D2.4 should read "Active frontages refers to elevations containing windows and doors, so that streets and spaces are overlooked" not " are not overlooked"</p> <p>Paragraph 8.D4.1 should read "The purpose of Policy D4 is to ensure new development is ready for connection to faster services. This promotes sustainable life/work patterns" not "live/work patterns.</p>	Noted	Yes						
			<p>Eighth bullet point should read "retain existing front hedges and trees and design boundary treatment etc. not "designing" boundary treatment.</p>	Noted	Yes						
			<p>Paragraph 8.D2.4 should read "Active frontages refers to elevations containing windows and doors, so that streets and spaces are overlooked" not " are not overlooked"</p>	Noted	Yes - double check						
			<p>Paragraph 8.D4.1 should read "The purpose of Policy D4 is to ensure new development is ready for connection to faster services. This promotes sustainable life/work patterns" not "live/work patterns.</p>	Noted	Yes	The wording should save live/work, this is the correct planning phrase, amend if incorrect.	changed back to live as per planning				
29	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Paragraph 8.18 There is only one SSSI within the Neighbourhood Development Plan area.</p>	Noted	Yes	Double Check!	amended wording				
30	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Paragraph 8.19 should read "Community engagement also identified issues or hazards of the natural environment, mainly due to flooding which can also be found" etc not mainly due to flooding "with" can also be</p>	Noted	Yes						
31	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Paragraph 8.20 should read "(Pg 64, Adopted Local Plan, 2012 - 2031" not 2012 -"2013"</p>	Noted	Yes						
32	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Paragraph 8.21 should read "(pg 56, Adopted Local Plan, 2012 - 2031" not 2012- "2013"</p>	Noted	Yes						
33	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Paragraph 8.24 paragraph SE01 states "ecosystem services are strengthened" not "strengthens", and "forces of change that it is experiencing" not "its"</p>	Noted	Yes						
34	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Paragraph 8.32 The results obtained from the original questionnaire indicated that the top five shops, services and amenities that villagers would like to see introduced into Rolleston on Dove were :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmland with working farms70% High speed internet61% Doctors surgery59% Pharmacy58% Community centre/village hall45% 	Noted	No						
35	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Policy D1 Green Infrastructure</p> <p>The second sentence in the first paragraph should read "where this is viable and deliverable.</p>	Noted	Yes						
36	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Policy OS1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bullet point 12 should read "Beacon Drive Verges" not Beacon Drive Island. Bullet point 13 should read "Shotwood Close Public Open Space" not Shotwood Close Island 	Noted	Yes but not 'verges'						
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bullet point 13 should read "Shotwood Close Public Open Space" not Shotwood Close Island 	Noted	Yes but not 'verges'						
37	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>Section 9 if this section is not part of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and is not to be examined it has no place in this document.</p>	Noted	No	This does form part of the NDP, however as it covers non-planning matters it is not subject to the independent examination.	noted no change				
38	23/05/2018 (letter dated 20/05/2018)	resident	<p>General Comments</p> <p>Plan Period</p> <p>ESBC's Local Plan covers the period 2012 to 2031 so to be in conformity with this Plan it would seem appropriate for the NDP to cover the same period. By extending the NDP to 2033 it may well not be in general conformity with the Local Plan as no one can predict what the Local Plan will contain for 2032 and 2033. Also by starting the period the NDP covers 3 years after the start of the Local Plan it does not reflect what has happened in the village since the start of the Local Plan period.</p> <p>Interpretation of Policies</p> <p>Whilst understanding that the intention is to clarify what the various Policies are to cover surely clearly laid out, unambiguously written Policies that do not need an "interpretation" would be a better way to go forward</p>	Noted	No	The NDP officially starts from the date it is 'Made' following the referendum. There is no statutory need for the end date to be aligned with the Local Plan, the NDP can provide a strategic planning framework beyond that period whilst the new local plan is being prepared, giving certainty.	noted no change				
			<p>Interpretation of Policies</p> <p>Whilst understanding that the intention is to clarify what the various Policies are to cover surely clearly laid out, unambiguously written Policies that do not need an "interpretation" would be a better way to go forward</p>	Noted	No	The interpretation provides clarity to the policy on how it should be applied.	noted no change				

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
			<p>Policy H1 Housing Requirements</p> <p>The Adopted Local Plan states there is a requirement for a Strategic Development of 100 dwellings in Rolleston on Dove plus it is proposed that the village has a Development Allowance allocation of another 25 dwellings to be delivered during the plan period. To date the 100 dwellings on the Strategic Development site have outline planning permission and are currently the subject of a reserved matters application, and 82 other dwellings have been granted planning permission, or were the subject of extant planning permissions, since the start of the plan period. This figure can be reduced by 1 to allow for the loss of 37 Burnside as a dwelling.</p>	Noted	No						
			It could be argued that this level of unplanned development is very important and should feature in the NDP to give a clear picture of the development that has taken place since the NDP was started in 2011.	Noted	No						
			I am not sure that the definition of "sustainable development" in H1 aligns with the most widely quoted definition which was that given by the Brundtland Commission " <i>Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs</i> "	Noted	No						
			There would appear to be no contingency plans for an alternative strategic allocation should it transpire the college field is undevelopable.	Noted	No	Add here that the evidence base for the NP did not raise site allocations as a point to cover and that NP's don't have to make these.	noted no change				
			I think there is a need for the NDP to detail what maintenance the parish council propose to undertake on the network of public footpaths and rights of way within the parish now that the county council has reduced its budget in this area. The parish council has intimated that it inevitably will have to do this work.	Noted	No	This is a non-planning matter, you could list this as a point in that section, as a 'to do' for the P.C?	noted no change				
			Given that the questionnaire which formed the basis for the original NDP was circulated to every dwelling in the village in summer 2012 it could be argued that this exercise should have been repeated in some way to ensure up to date information was used in preparing this NDP especially given the amount of unplanned development that has already been approved.	Noted	No						
39	29/05/2018	resident	Further to my email below of 23 May, please could you confirm whether the Rolleston-on-Dove Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has been withdrawn, corrected and reissued and corrected. Otherwise I would need to consider legal action and consider contacting the ESBC Standards Committee.	Noted	Plan modified						
40	29/05/2018	Natural England	Natural England does not consider that this Neighbourhood plan poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	Noted UVE to advise	No						
41	11/06/2018	Woodland Trust	<p>Vision and Aims: The Woodland Trust is pleased to see that your vision for Rolleston on Dove identifies the need to maintain and enhance its agriculture and environment, its quality of the appearance of its landscape and how it is enriched by its open aspect to the countryside. Whilst also seeking to avoid harm to important landscape views, and maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>Trees are some of the most important features of the area for local people. Already, this is being acknowledged with the East Staffordshire Local Plan (2015), and one of the key challenges is to protect and enhance the Borough's natural environment, whilst Detailed Policy 8 gives tree protection for trees within development sites, and strategic policy 23 (Green Infrastructure) puts in place standards that must be met and all development design must include street trees and urban woodland where applicable. Therefore, this should also be taken into account as one of the aims of your Neighbourhood Plan for Rolleston on Dove, and include the following:</p> <p>"To protect and enhance the local environment, green and open spaces, ancient woodland, veteran trees hedgerows and trees".</p>	Noted	No	You could include this as an additional aim.	amended aim 7 to include Woodland Trust proposal				
42	11/06/2018	Woodland Trust	<p>Natural Environment: We are pleased to see that the Neighbourhood Plan for Rolleston on Dove does identify the need to conserve and enhance its landscape, and how any new development in your Parish needs to respect its distinctive landscape character.</p> <p>However, your Plan should also seek to ensure development must conserve mature trees and hedgerows, so there is no loss or degradation of ancient woodland in your parish. It should also support enhancing woodland and trees, such as Oak trees, with management, and also to plant more trees in appropriate locations. Increasing the amount of trees and woods in Rolleston on Dove will provide enhanced green infrastructure for your local communities, and also mitigate against the future loss of trees to disease (eg Ash dieback), with a new generation of trees both in woods and also outside woods in streets, hedgerows and amenity sites.</p> <p>Information can be found here: http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.asp and http://www.ancient-tree-hunt.org.uk/discoveries/interactivemap/</p> <p>Ancient woodland would benefit from strengthened protection building on the National Planning Policy Forum (NPPF). On 5th March 2018 the Prime Minister Theresa May launched the draft revised NPPF for consultation. Paragraph 173 c states:</p> <p>development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable mitigation strategy exists. Where development would involve the loss of individual aged or veteran trees that lie outside ancient woodland, it should be refused unless the need for, and benefits of, development in that location would clearly outweigh the loss</p>	Noted UVE to advise	No	In the non-planning you can look for new opportunities for tree planting and in the community infrastructure policy we could list the creation of new woodland areas.	amended in nonplanning section 9 added 9.10 re tree nursery				

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
			<p>Whilst recognising that this policy is draft we believe it must be given due weight in the plan making process as it shows a clear direction of travel from central Government to strengthen the protection of irreplaceable ancient woodland.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst Policy NE2 does seek to preserve or enhance the natural environment, it should also acknowledge more effectively the fact that Substantial harm to or loss of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland and trees, should be wholly exceptional.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust would suggest that your Neighbourhood Plan is more specific about ancient woodland protection. For example, the introduction and background to the consultation on the Kimbolton Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017) identified the importance of ancient woodland, and how it should be protected and enhanced. Also, we would like to see buffering distances set out. For example, for most types of development (i.e. residential), a planted buffer strip of 50m would be preferred to protect the core of the woodland in the geographical area of your Neighbourhood Plan. Standing Advice from Natural England and the Forestry Commission has some useful information: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences</p> <p>The profile of Rolleston on Dove identifies the need to retain and enhance its rural character as a small rural settlement, and also the need for development to integrate with the landscape. Given that Neighbourhood Plans are a great opportunity to think about how trees can also enhance your community and the lives of its residents, the natural environment and tree and woodland conservation, should also be taken into account with a Policy in your Plan.</p> <p>Therefore, we would like to see the importance of trees and woodland recognised for providing healthy living and recreation also being taken into account with your Neighbourhood Plan for Rolleston on Dove. In an era of ever increasing concern about the nation's physical and mental health, the Woodland Trust strongly believes that trees and woodland can play a key role in delivering improved health & wellbeing at a local level. Whilst, at the same time, the Health & Social Care Act 2012 has passed much of the responsibility for health & wellbeing to upper-tier and unitary local authorities, and this is reinforced by the Care Act 2014. Also, each new house being built in your parish should require a new street tree, and also car parks must have trees within them.</p>								
43	11/06/2018	Woodland Trust	<p>Community Facilities: Whilst Policy 8 in your Neighbourhood Plan does seek to resist the loss of open space, whilst also ensuring the provision of some more, to what extent there is considered to be enough accessible space in your community also needs to be taken into account. There are Natural England and Forestry Commission standards which can be used with developers on this: The Woodland Access Standard aspires: • That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size. • That there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people's homes.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust also believes that trees and woodlands can deliver a major contribution to resolving a range of water management issues, particularly those resulting from climate change, like flooding and the water quality implications caused by extreme weather events. This is important in the area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan because trees offer opportunities to make positive water use change, whilst also contributing to other objectives, such as biodiversity, timber & green infrastructure - see the Woodland Trust publication Stemming the flow – the role of trees and woods in flood protection - https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2014/05/stemming-the-flow/.</p> <p>The delivery of your Neighbourhood Development Plan should also be identified as a detailed objective and one of the priorities in your Plan, such as the principal importance of landscaping, and it should also seek to protect ancient hedgerows and deciduous woodlands, as well as also seeking to retain and enhance open green spaces and resist the loss of open space. It should also ensure the provision of some more, to what extent there is considered to be enough accessible open space in your community also needs to be taken into account. There are Natural England and Forestry Commission standards which can be used with developers on this:</p> <p>The Woodland Access Standard aspires: • That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size. • That there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people's homes.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust also believes that trees and woodlands can deliver a major contribution to resolving a range of water management issues, particularly those resulting from climate change, like flooding and the water quality implications caused by extreme weather events. This is important in the area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan because trees offer opportunities to make positive water use change, whilst also contributing to other objectives, such as biodiversity, timber & green infrastructure - see the Woodland Trust publication Stemming the flow – the role of trees and woods in flood protection - https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2014/05/stemming-the-flow/.</p>	Noted UVE to advise	Plan not modified	See above	amended policy ne1 flood risk in interpretation added tree mitigation				
44	11/06/2018	Woodland Trust	<p>Woodland Trust Publications: We would like to take this opportunity to draw your attention to the Woodland Trust's neighbourhood planning microsite: https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/campaigning/neighbourhood-planning/ which may give you further ideas for your plan and monitoring progress.</p> <p>Also, the Woodland Trust have recently released a planners manual which is a multi-purpose document and is intended for policy planners, such as community groups preparing Neighbourhood Plans. Our guide can be found at: https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/mediafile/100820409/planning-for-ancient-woodland-planners-manual-for-ancient-woodland-and-veterantrees.pdf?cb=8298cbf2eaa34c7da329eee3bd8d48ff</p> <p>In addition other Woodland Trust research which may assist with taking your Neighbourhood Plan foreword is a policy and practice section on our website, which provides lots of more specific evidence on more specific issues such as air quality, pollution and tree disease: https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/</p>	Noted UVE to advise	No	In the earlier section of the NDP you could quote some of these documents if it was useful to support the case for protecting trees and woodland.					

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
45	11/06/2018	Staffordshire County Council	<p>Ecology: Aim 7 specifically mentions protection of wildlife habitats and paragraphs 7.5 to 7.11 refer to specific areas that should be protected. Additional sites that could also be included are: • Old River Dove Site of Special Scientific Interest. • Dismantled Railway to north of Jinny Trail – this is listed as a Biodiversity Alert Site (BAS) indicating that it of local importance for wildlife (Brook Hollows is also a BAS) • All watercourses are important wildlife corridors, linking to the Dove. • The allotments site next to Jubilee Orchard could also be included as a recreational site in the list; given the recognised importance of gardening for health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Transforming the Trent Valley Landscape Partnership Scheme, a Lottery funded partnership project, led by Staffordshire Wildlife Trust, is looking for opportunities for enhancement of habitats and for improvements of connectivity for species and which covers part of the Parish. The Plan might wish to consider inclusion of aspirations for conservation of existing habitats and for enhancements for wildlife such as woodland planting and hedgerow restoration and planting, creation of species-rich wildflower meadows and river restoration to bring back natural features for wildlife. There may be opportunities to achieve such benefits via new development and associated green infrastructure and sustainable drainage provision.</p> <p>The plan could refer to potential for new development to contribute to existing green infrastructure by providing enhancements to Local Green Spaces or assisting in their management for wildlife.</p>	Noted UVE to advise	No	These could be updated in the LGS descriptions. You could add these as additional LGS and undertake some consultation prior to Reg-14.	LC to speak to Hannah and TV partnership. Mark Parkinson SCC economic development... 01785276807		Included the old jinny disused railway line north in section 7.19. Added wording from 3rd para to OS1		
46	43262	Staffordshire County Council	<p>Historic Environment: The Neighbourhood Plan includes eight aims the third of which seeks to ensure that development will "complement and enhance the historic rural character" and this aim is to be welcomed. That being said there is otherwise little within the document which relates to the historic environment beyond passing references to the Conservation Area and the presence of Listed Buildings. The conservation and enhancement of the historic environment is included in Chapter 12 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and East Staffordshire Borough Council's adopted Local Plan (Strategic Policy (SP) 25: Historic Environment). The baseline evidence for the Local Plan utilised the East Staffordshire Historic Environment Character Assessment (HECA) (2013) whose aim was to provide a detailed assessment of the historic environment character which evaluated the impact of medium to large scale housing development within the District. Appendix 1 included an assessment of the immediate historic landscape character around Rolleston-on-Dove and its associated heritage assets. The Neighbourhood Plan team may wish to consider incorporating the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment as one of its policies and the HECA may provide a useful starting point. The document can be found at https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/eLand/plannersdevelopers/HistoricEnvironment/Projects/Historic-EnvironmentAssessments.aspx#EastStaffordshireHEA</p> <p>Further information on the historic environment of Rolleston-on-Dove parish can be obtained from the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record, which records all the known archaeological sites, monuments and buildings within the county. It also includes the results of the Historic Landscape Character (HLC), which was undertaken between 2003 and 2006 and was used to underpin the HECA. Further information can be found at https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/eLand/plannersdevelopers/HistoricEnvironment/HistoricEnvironmentHomePage.aspx</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan may also benefit from a more detailed understanding of the character of the village itself, which could provide a benchmark for considering what may constitute good design within the local environment of Rolleston-on-Dove, particularly in areas outside of the Conservation Area. Historic England provides guidelines to assist communities in considering the historic environment as part of their Neighbourhood Plans, which includes guidance on producing character assessments (https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/). The Whittington and Fisherwick Neighbourhood Plan represents a good example of an approved plan which has included policies on the historic environment and was supported by a historic character assessment and can be found at https://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/Council/Planning/The-local-plan-and-planningpolicy/Neighbourhood-plans/Downloads/Whittington-Fisherwick/Whittington-Fisherwickneighbourhood-plan-Made-17-April-2018.pdf</p>	Noted UVE to advise	No	Suggest contacting Staffordshire County Council to ask them to be more specific about the wording they are asking for to amend the policy, as it is unclear exactly what needs adding.	LC to speak re this				
47	11/06/2018	Staffordshire County Council	<p>Landscape: In setting the context for the parish it might be useful to refer to Planning for Landscape Change, the adopted Landscape Character Assessment for Staffordshire. For information the parish straddles two Landscape Character Types: Riparian Alluvial Lowlands in the Trent Valley Washlands occupying the floodplain of the Dove to the north of Rolleston; with the remainder of the parish falling with Settled Plateau Farmlands Slopes in the Needwood Claylands. Details of the spatial distribution of the Landscape Character Types can be found at https://apps2.staffordshire.gov.uk/WEB/OnTheMap/NatureandWildlife and their descriptions at https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/eLand/plannersdevelopers/landscape/NaturalEnvironmentLandscapeCharacterTypes.aspx Policy D2 Design of New Development is supported. It is suggested that the penultimate bullet point is clarified so that it does not just point to front boundary hedges and trees. The aspiration to create a soft edge transition between built area and open landscape is strongly supported to enhance the setting of the village and buffer the rural character of the surrounding landscape. Policy OS2 Protection of Views of Local Importance is also supported. North side of Station Road falls within the Riparian Alluvial Lowlands Character Type, and is inside the boundary of the Transforming the Trent Valley (TTTV) Project Area. It may be possible to attract support and funding for maintaining and enhancing this area through TTTV. Other Policies NE2: Natural Environment and OS1 Protection of local green spaces are also supported.</p>	Noted UVE to advise	No	Noted that the policies are supported, you could make reference to these documents referred to in the earlier sections of the plan further describe the landscape character.		deleted word front from D2. Ask UVE where this is placed			

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
48	11/06/2018	Staffordshire County Council	<p>Rights of Way: Public Rights of Way are recognised within the plan as important to the local landscape and community with specific mention being made in the aims of the plan, D1 Green Infrastructure, D5 Traffic and Transport and 9.7 Community Projects.</p> <p>It is suggested that the Plan should encourage developers to seek to enhance the existing path network where possible in line with Staffordshire County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This could include: - the creation of public bridleways or the upgrading of public footpaths to bridleways to improve provision for horse riders and cyclists. - the creation and promotion of short circular walks to promote the health benefits of walking - the replacement of stiles with gaps (where there are no stock) or gates (where there are) in line with Staffordshire County Council's Least Restrictive Principle for path furniture</p> <p>The Rights of Way team would be happy to provide advice and work together on any schemes which benefit residents through improvements to the path network.</p>	Noted UVE to advise	No	Policy D1 does identify improvements to: existing footpaths and bridleways and cycle networks.		noted			
49	11/06/2018	Staffordshire County Council	<p>Flood Risk: It is acknowledged that the Plan points out the particular problems of flooding in the village. It is important to note that there are two primary sources of flooding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flooding from the Rolleston Brook and River Dove. These Main Rivers overtop and cause flooding in various locations and particularly Brookside. Both rivers are under the supervision of the Environment Agency. 2. Flooding from Beacon Hill and from surface water generally. As well as the fluvial flood risk mentioned above. There are significant problems dealing with surface water and land drainage. This is mainly caused by persistent and heavy rainfall on Beacon Hill. There are then only a small number of routes for water to flow off the hill, through the village and join either the Rolleston Brook or the River Dove. The network of pipes and drains is archaic and suffers in places from root infiltration, siltation and debris causing blockages. <p>Unfortunately, much of this network described above is not adopted as either public sewer or adopted highway drain. As a result, there is a lack of regular inspection and maintenance. The systems have deteriorated as a result. SCC is attempting to bring forward a Flood Alleviation Scheme for the village that will alleviate some of the problems in the area.</p> <p>To ensure that the problems are not made any worse it is suggested that the following be included within Policy NE1: 1) All discharges of surface water from new development must be restricted to green field run-off rates. That would help overall flooding stresses on existing systems. 2) Development may be required to contribute to improvements to the drainage system in the Parish</p> <p>It should also be noted that if East Staffordshire Borough Council bring forward a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule works to relieve flooding could be included as an issue in the list of potential schemes that funding could be allocated to. In addition any CIL Neighbourhood proportion passed to the Parish could be used to address flooding issues.</p> <p><i>In relation to the changing facilities are proposed at Cravthorne Road Plaving Fields it is suggested you consult our</i></p>	Noted UVE to advise	No	Clarify with ESBC on the 2 points suggested to be included what they consider could be included in the policy or if they are building regulations. The other suggestions could be added to the interpretation of the policy.		included suggested wording and made new 7.18. Included bullet points in policy as advised by SCC			
50	11/06/2018	Staffordshire County Council	<p>Transport: The policies and supporting text around transport identify local issues to be considered in development management and are considered appropriate.</p>	oted	No						
51	11/06/2018	Staffordshire County Council	<p>High Speed Connectivity: It is noted that the Plan contains policy around high speed internet connectivity which is supported. We have seen a number of examples of policy around internet connectivity, which have been refined over time taking on experience from other plans. We would therefore suggest the below policy text for consideration, which may be more effective in delivering your desired outcomes:</p> <p>'New development will contribute to and be compatible with local fiber or other high speed broadband infrastructure. Where possible new development should be connected to high speed broadband infrastructure capable of providing minimum download speed of 30Mbps. This will be demonstrated through a 'Connectivity Statement' submitted with planning applications. Such statements should set out the anticipated connectivity requirements of the development; known data networks nearby and their anticipated speed (fiber, fixed copper, 3G, 4G, satellite, microwave, etc.); and a description of how the development will connect with or contribute to any such networks.</p> <p>Where no strategic telecommunications infrastructure is available locally and it would be unviable for development to provide it then suitable ducting that can accept fiber should be provided within the development site and either to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the existing public highway; or • a community led local access network; or • another location that can be justified through the connectivity statement.' <p>It is acknowledged that paragraph 8.D4.3 refers developers to work with providers. It would be useful for this to emphasize 'early discussions'. The main providers now have new sites teams that work with developers to install the necessary cabling etc. during the build phase. We are aware of instances elsewhere in the country where development has taken place on the assumption that internet can be provided post occupation. However, this requires new excavations in footways etc. that can be subject to clauses for no excavations for a period of years after first adoption and/or can prove to be prohibitively expensive. It is suggested that within the text here the Plan requires developers to demonstrate through their connectivity statement that they have engaged with a relevant provider/s.</p>	Noted UVE to advise	No	The wording 'Where Possible' weakens the policy. Some of this could be added to the interpretation.		amended 8.D4.3			

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
52	06/06/2018	Environment Agency	The River Dove (Main River) forms the northern boundary of the plan area and has a well-defined floodplain (Flood Zones 2 and 3) which covers approximately one third of the parish. Tutbury Mill Fleam (Main River) is located within this floodplain area, south of the River Dove. The Rolleston Brook (Main River) bisects the parish and has associated areas of floodplain and properties at risk of flooding. There are Environment Agency maintained flood defences on the Tutbury Mill Fleam. Environment Agency flood warning areas cover Rolleston and Alder Moor. There are also a number of ordinary watercourses as well as large areas at risk of surface water flooding. Staffordshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted on these matters.	Noted	No						
53	06/06/2018	Environment Agency	Vision and Aims We support Aim 6 regarding flood risk but suggest that it could be improved as follows: To ensure that any development in Rolleston on Dove does not increase the risk of flooding from watercourses and surface water runoff within the parish or elsewhere.	wording replaced	Yes						
54	06/06/2018	Environment Agency	Environment: Local Green Spaces We support the designation of green spaces at the Croft, Brook Hollows, Brookside, Cricket Pitches and Orchard adjacent to bottom of South Hill due to their potential role in managing flood risk and flood mitigation in the area.	Noted	No						
55	06/06/2018	Environment Agency	Policies: Flooding We support the inclusion of this section but consider that further detail on the nature of the flood risk be included to set the context of the issue and the impacts on the parish. Rolleston on Dove is at risk of flooding from both watercourses and surface water runoff. Flooding has been recorded on numerous occasions, with the March 2018 flood event being the most recent severe occurrence. Much of the recent flooding is due to the surface water drainage system being overwhelmed with overland flows and the surface water network being unable to discharge into the Rolleston Brook when either the River Dove or Rolleston Brook have high flows. This is exacerbated by passing traffic causing bow waves. Staffordshire County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, is working with the local community and flood action group to develop and implement measures to reduce flood risk to around 100 properties. 7.16 Recommend that the wording of this section is slightly amended as follows: The latest information on flood risk is available on the Environment Agency website: https://www.gov.uk/check-flood-risk This includes current flood warnings, https://flood-warninginformation.service.gov.uk/warnings , and the latest information on river levels https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/river-and-sea-levels	Noted	No						
56	06/06/2018	Environment Agency	Policies: Housing H1: Housing Requirements This policy could be strengthened by adding the following to the list of development requirements: 5. Be directed away from those areas at highest flood risk, i.e. towards Flood Zone 6. Demonstrate that it will not increase flood risk elsewhere, both in and out of the parish. 7. Consider future flood risk and, where appropriate, include measures that mitigate and adapt to the anticipated impacts of climate change.	Noted UVE to advise	No	You could add a point to say 'Must not comprise, flood category...' and set out where that is, and add point 6 and then point 7 to be added to the flood policy.	amended to ESBC wording				
57	06/06/2018	Environment Agency	Policies: Character and Design D1: Green Infrastructure This policy could be strengthened by adding a requirement to retain and enhance river floodplains and habitats and a statement that any open watercourses should not be culverted. Where possible opportunities should be taken to open up any existing culverts to reduce the associated flood risk and danger of collapse as well as enhancing biodiversity and green infrastructure. D2: Design of New Development This policy could be strengthened by adding: <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to reduce flood risk and manage surface water and to ensure that runoff does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Long-term maintenance arrangements for all SuDS should also be in place for the lifetime of the development and agreed with the relevant risk management authority.	Noted UVE to advise	No	Make these changes, but to add the flood plain we will need a plan to show the extent of the area.		amended D1 and D2 as suggested. Will check flood maps are included	LC to include two flood maps in appendix and refer in 7.18.1		
58	06/06/2018	Environment Agency	Natural Environment: Flood Risk NE1 We welcome the inclusion of a specific policy on 'Flood Risk' but consider that it would be strengthened and aligned with the key aims of the plan by stating that the aim is also to avoid any new development in areas at highest flood risk taking into account the likely impacts of climate change, as well as not exacerbating the current risk of flooding. Planning applications for development within the Neighbourhood Plan area must be accompanied by site-specific flood risk assessments in line with the requirements of national planning policy and advice. These should take account of the latest climate change allowances. Consideration should also be given to the impact of new development on both existing and future flood risk. It could be further expanded to cover a wider range of relevant 'flood risk management' issues including the following: <input type="checkbox"/> A clear statement that, in line with national policy, all new development should be directed away from those areas at highest flood risk, i.e. towards Flood Zone 1. <input type="checkbox"/> A clarification that new development proposals must also demonstrate that they will not increase flood risk elsewhere both in and out of the parish. <input type="checkbox"/> A requirement for all new development, including infill development and small scale development, to incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to reduce flood risk and manage surface water and to ensure that runoff does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Long-term maintenance arrangements for all SuDS should also be in place for the lifetime of the development and agreed with the relevant risk management authority. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals for new development should consider future flood risk and, where appropriate, include measures that mitigate and adapt to the anticipated impacts of climate change. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing open watercourses should not be culverted. Where feasible, opportunities to open up culverted watercourses should be sought to reduce the associated flood risk and danger of collapse whilst taking advantage of opportunities to enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure. <input type="checkbox"/> A requirement to retain and enhance river habitats and taking opportunities to improve connectivity. <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation of natural flood management measures will be encouraged and promoted to contribute towards delivering a reduction in local and catchmentwide flood risk and the impacts of climate change as well as achieve other wider environmental benefits.	Noted UVE to advise	No	This could be added to the interpretation.		added to aim 6. Group to review remaining advise	Reviewed. Added culvert wording to D2 policy		

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
			<p>Making the most of heritage in a neighbourhood plan Guy Robinson from Historic England has prepared a checklist outlining what can be done to preserve local heritage assets in your neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Planning Champions Do you have an issue locally and need some help? Have you thought about asking a champion? Don't worry if there isn't anyone local, you can ask anyone on our champions map. All of the champions are experienced in neighbourhood planning, with areas of expertise such as engaging with the community, forging good working relations with the LPA and evidence gathering to name a few.</p> <p>Would you like to be a Neighbourhood Planning Champion? Applications are now open to become a Neighbourhood Planning Champion on the new 2018-22 Neighbourhood Planning programme.</p> <p>Champions – we want to interview you Are you a neighbourhood planning champion? Have you been doing some good work to help local groups? Do you want to be interviewed for our January newsletter? If so it would be good to hear from you. We are interested in tricky issues that have been resolved or any unique challenges that you have encountered in your role as a champion.</p> <p>Top tips: Evidence gathering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence needs to be proportionate: There is no universal level or specific type of evidence that is required to inform a neighbourhood plan. Much will depend on the focus of the plan's policies which in turn will be determined by what local engagement and consultation throws up as priorities for the plan. Don't reinvent the wheel: a lot of the evidence and data required to inform a neighbourhood plan may already exist and your LPA will be the source for much of it. Liaising positively with your LPA will make the job of getting and understanding this evidence much easier. Examples of evidence your LPA can provide includes data on things such as demographics, trees, public bi-ways, flooding, employment, traffic or existing community infrastructure. Plugging the evidence gaps: You might also find you need to undertake your own evidence gathering and this could include information on local heritage, landscape, noise or things like how people use their local area and how they get around. Planning Aid England and the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) have produced two new videos targeted at a neighbourhood planning audience. Lorraine Hart author of Locality's guide to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) discusses CIL for neighbourhood planning groups. Mary Kucharska from Aecom summarises the technical support packages in the current 2018-22 neighbourhood planning programme and any changes from the 2015-18 programme. <p>Technical support – finding out more about our Site options and assessment package Are you planning to allocate sites for housing in your neighbourhood plan? If so, then the site options and assessment package of technical support may be for you. The objective of site options and assessment is to determine which sites are suitable for development. There are 3 broad stages for site allocations. As you will see below, the site options and assessment is the middle and most detailed stage in the 3-stage process of allocating development sites in a neighbourhood plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stage 1 - Call for sites: Invite landowners in your neighbourhood area to put their land forward for assessment and potential allocation. Check with your LPA to see if they have already run a call for sites. You may find that you can use the LPA's call-for-sites and run another one which identifies smaller sites too. Stage 2 - Site options and assessment: Now you have a list of sites, these will be assessed to determine whether they are suitable for development. The free AECOM support package uses a traffic light system indicating whether a site is Suitable for development (green), Suitable for development with some mitigation (yellow), or Not suitable for development (red). Site assessment is the stage completed as part of the free AECOM support package. There is also an online toolkit for groups who wish to assess sites themselves. Stage 3 - Site allocation: Now sites suitable for development have been identified you will need to decide as a community which of these sites you wish to allocate in your neighbourhood plan. This will be informed by local housing need and popularity of sites among those who live and work in the neighbourhood area. We have a host of helpful toolkits on our website. Here are two that we think you'll find very useful. <p>How to establish a neighbourhood planning forum Our guide to establishing a neighbourhood forum gives you a clear and concise overview of the steps and requirements for those seeking to establish a neighbourhood forum.</p> <p>General conformity with strategic local planning policy The guidance deals with how to identify strategic local policies and how to consider whether your plan is in general conformity with these policies (a basic condition)</p> <p>Case studies Have you seen our neighbourhood planning case studies? These case studies explore the approach taken by different neighbourhood plan groups with certain objectives. For example, the Newport Pagnell case study focuses on how to bring forward local infrastructure using growth. Whilst the Bembridge one explores how working with developers helped to bring forward suitable new housing for the community.</p>								
66	13/10/2018	Open Day 13/10/2018 - residents	The main comments from the Shotwood Close residents, 6 persons, was associated with loss of view due to tree line along their garden boundary and the farmers implements obscuring their views of the fields. Nothing to do with the NDP								noted
67	13/10/2018	Open Day 13/10/18 - resident	The "owner" of the orchard "green space" along Station Road attended and was annoyed that we have included the orchard in the plan again and why we had not removed the "green space" from the plan. We explained the reasoning why the orchard is still in the plan. He stated that he was expecting a response to his previous objections to the plan discussed in May of this year. We again explained why no response. I am not sure if we have satisfied his concerns								noted no action

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18	
			<p>The Woodland Trust also believes that trees and woodlands can deliver a major contribution to resolving a range of water management issues, particularly those resulting from climate change, like flooding and the water quality implications caused by extreme weather events. This is important in the area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan because trees offer opportunities to make positive water use change, whilst also contributing to other objectives, such as biodiversity, timber & green infrastructure - see the Woodland Trust publication Stemming the flow – the role of trees and woods in flood protection - https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2014/05/stemming-the-flow/.</p> <p>Woodland Trust Publications We would like to take this opportunity to draw your attention to the Woodland Trust's neighbourhood planning microsite: https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/campaigning/neighbourhood-planning/ which may give you further ideas for your plan. Also, the Woodland Trust have recently released a planners manual which is a multi-purpose document and is intended for policy planners, such as community groups preparing Neighbourhood Plans. Our guide can be found at: https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/mediafile/100820409/planning-for-ancient-woodland-planners-manual-for-ancient-woodland-and-veterantrees.pdf?cb=8298cbf2eaa34c7da329eee3bd8d48ff In addition other Woodland Trust research which may assist with taking your Neighbourhood Plan foreword is a policy and practice section on our website, which provides lots of more specific evidence on more specific issues such as air quality, pollution and tree disease: https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/ Our evidence base is always expanding through vigorous programme of PhDs and partnership working. So please do check back or get in touch if you have a specific query. You may also be interested in our free community tree packs, schools and community groups can claim up to 420 free trees every planting season: http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/plant-trees/community-tree-pack/ If I can be of any assistance please do not hesitate to get in touch, I would be more than happy to discuss this further with you. If you require any further information or would like to discuss specific issues please do not hesitate to contact Victoria Bankes Price – Planning Advisor 0343 7705767 victoriabankesprice@woodlandtrust.org.uk</p>								updated OS2	
70	01/11/2018	residents' letter	<p>The Orchard belonging to 234 Station Road</p> <p>We strongly object to the designation of our land as a "Local Green Space" within the Neighbourhood Plan. This designation is not reasonable, nor is it justified when this issue is considered against the relevant paragraphs contained within the NPPF (2018). Of particular relevance is the requirement for the area in question to be: "demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife"</p> <p>It is essential that, when allocating Local Green Space, plan-makers can clearly demonstrate that the requirements for its allocation are met in full. None of the above requirements apply to the land in question and to date the Steering Group has not published any robust or compelling evidence which confirms otherwise</p> <p>This is a private landholding containing fruit trees and a storage building, it is of limited significance. It has no historical significance or defined relationship with designated or non-designated heritage assets, it is distant from the defined conservation area and other heritage assets such as listed buildings. It has no public access (through public rights of way) which would define recreational value. It is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory wildlife designations which would define ecological value and it is not subject to any landscape designations which would objectively define any particular beauty. As such, we rebut the designation of this land in the strongest possible terms. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this issue further with the Neighbourhood Plan Group and examine the evidence relied upon</p> <p>We look forward to a response in due course so that this matter can be resolved</p>								noted	
71	06/11/2018	Natural England	<p>Rolleston on Dove Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 24th September 2018. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this neighbourhood plan.</p>								noted	
72	02/11/2018	resident	<p>Bottom of Page 9, top of Page 10 - numbering goes from 4.9 to 4.11.</p> <p>Page 10, item 4.14. Mosleys does not require an apostrophe, it is a plural, nothing belongs to it, likewise in 4.15.</p> <p>Page 10 item 4.17. Comma not required after the word mainly.</p> <p>Page 34 item 7.18. Final sentence, the word it (after comma) needs removing.</p> <p>Page 48, item 8.22 sub para e. First line - spacing between words needs adding and the word "and" be removed from the end of same sub para.</p> <p>Page 49 item 8.23 sub para b. A social objective not An social objective.</p> <p>Page 49 item 8.25 line 2. Recognizing should read recognising.</p> <p>Page 56 item 9.1 line 3 - typo spelling error for the word Council.</p> <p>Page 56, item 9.3 line 2 - Overtime should be split into two words (Over time).</p> <p>Throughout document the word Parish needs to consistently either have or not have an initial cap.</p>								noted and amended	
73	09/10/2118	ESBC	<p><u>Rolleston Neighbourhood Plan comments</u></p> <p><u>Executive Summary</u></p> <p>Please note the Local Plan covers a plan period of 2012 – 2031. It is acceptable for the Neighbourhood Plan to cover a different time period however if so, a brief explanation (either in the plan or the basic conditions statement) would be useful</p> <p>The plan in several places makes reference to 'atmosphere'. Given that the Neighbourhood Plan is a planning document, consider the word 'character' is easier to quantify in planning terms</p>							Remove numbering from interpretation of policies- ok LC	Explanation of time period of plan - HB to draft	ok - modify - LC

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
			Only applicable to 10+ housing schemes. Needs to say that "Major developments".... Not just development proposals.							ok - modify-LC	
			With reference to on site contributions – do you mean off site?							Yes - modify- LC	
			8.D1.1 – what is the intention of this sentence? Local Green Space can only be identified through planning policy. Do you mean that the Parish Council wish to take on the management of any new open spaces? Other open spaces, including new ones (not Local Green Spaces) can also be identified in the plan.							done	
			Policy D2								
			What is meant by 'authentic' materials? It would be useful if you took information from the Conservation Area Appraisal on what are the predominant traditional materials in Rolleston and listed these as those which developments must incorporate (but also stating that the list is not exhaustive and that there will be exceptions where alternative materials may be acceptable).							HB to draft	
			I notice in the text before the policy that you seek new dwellings to have a large front garden so there is space for a tree to be planted, however this isn't in the policy itself. If this is the case – are front gardens a key feature of the character of the settlement?							take out tree policy - LC	
			8.D2.7 – with regards to community engagement – how do you envisage this happening? Are there any additional requirements?							add UVE suggested sentence - LC	
			Policy D3								
			Garage size comment is not useful for decision makers – would be better to make reference to a specific size standard. 3rd and 5th points can be amalgamated. Would advise that you look at the Borough Councils parking standards SPD with regards to garage sizes.							Add ref to Borough Council standard - LC	
			Policy D4								
			Would be useful if the Plan (or the group separately) provided a 'validation checklist' for applicants submitting applications which would also aid the planning officer in determining the application (and also assist the Parish Council make comments on planning applications).							noted - no change	
			With regards to the word 'Must' – what if it's not possible and delivery would make a scheme unviable. What is the threshold for when a connectivity statement is required? Even for 1 dwelling?							ok-done	
			Policy OS1								
			Suggested reword to say Developments that affect these views and vistas must be supported with a Design and Access Statement which demonstrates how the proposal would impact them. Schemes to improve and enhance them will be encouraged.								
			It would also be useful if the policy clearly set out the situations where the 'harm' to the view would result in a refusal – i.e. excessive scale? Obstruction? Planting? Are the views as a whole important? What if development was low level? What if development ensure there were glimpses through?							ok-reword-LC	
			Policy NE1								
			What if one of these can't be achieved / not a viable option (last one may be difficult to do) – does the application fail? In planning, it is rarely reasonable to require proposals to improve the current situation, only to mitigate the proposal.							HB to draft rewords	
			Policy NE2								
			Where are the orchards and veteran trees? Would be useful if the plan included a definition of veteran trees.							SMcM or ask ESBC for map	
			8.29 – Consider this paragraph is in the wrong place							check this is in right place - LC	
			Policy OS2								
			The policy should list the Local Green Spaces – and/or cross reference to a plan showing them and set out the exceptional circumstances where development would be permitted. For clarity, the policy shouldn't say development 'may' be allowed it should be clearer. Local Green Space designation is very strict – akin to Green Belt. I don't consider the examples of 'small scale' are useful in this instance – a sports pavilion could be a large structure.							1st setence modified - done	
			If it is useful, other examples of similar policies are:								
			Winshill								
			<i>Policy 2 Local Green Space</i>								
			<i>Each of the nine areas in the table above and shown on the proposals map, are designated as Local Green Space where new development is ruled out other than in very special circumstances.</i>								
			Uttoxeter								
			<i>Policy L2 – Local Green Spaces</i>								
			<i>The following areas and as shown on the Proposals Map are designated as Local Green Spaces due to their special character, significance and community value. The sites will be protected from development that would be inappropriate to their designation as local green spaces. Sensitive proposals for educational, recreation and leisure uses will be supported where they contribute towards the use and effectiveness of the local green space concerned and where its overall open aspect is retained.</i>							comments noted, change policy to read 'Development will be supported where...'	
			Non-Planning issues								
			9.5 – If more explanation of the Transforming the Trent Valley HLF is useful:							Add - LC	
			Transforming the Trent Valley (TTTV) is a partnership of 18 voluntary and statutory organisations and quarry operators who are working together to restore and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the Trent Valley. In 2016 Staffordshire Wildlife Trust applied to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) for a first stage grant that would enable the development of a range of engaging projects aimed at reconnecting communities, children and families with the river and its valley.								
			Work started in spring 2017 and, following 18 months of hard work, a second stage application to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a grant of £2.7m was submitted. There is still some way to go before anything can be delivered on the ground but Brook Hollows, a project restoring the culturally important lakes at the heart of Rolleston is identified within the bid. If successful, project delivery will begin in 2019 and take approximately five years.							Add - LC	
			9.6 - not sure what is meant by 'unloading docs'?							typo - docks- done	
			9.9 – Reference to the S106 from College Fields development would be useful as this will contribute towards the provision of changing rooms.							noted - no change	
			Addition – it would be useful to include a monitoring section – how will the success of the Neighbourhood Plan be monitored?							Yes - add o intro draft-HB	

Item Number	Date	Source	Comment	Response + date Review dates: 22/06/18 & 27/06/18	Plan modified?	UVE Comments 3/7/18	Group Review 2/8/18	Group Review 8/8/18	Group Review 14/9/18	Group Review 23/11/18	Group Review 30/11/18
74	16/11/2018 forwarded 21/11/2018	ESBC	<p>Following our meeting last week, please find links and information below relating to Monitoring Neighbourhood Plans and how others have included this into their plans: Anglesey (page 41)</p> <p>They advise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Set a regular time period for a review of your neighbourhood plan; annually, · Use your responses on planning applications, and an assessment of how far ESBC has taken them into consideration, as an indicator of your success in getting policies implemented. From this work you can also begin to identify policies that are not working so well, and not influencing development proposals as you intended. · Problems with a policy may be due to drafting errors, or may be due to national or local plan policy changing and making some policy in your neighbourhood plan out of date. · If your monitoring indicates implementation problems are emerging, then you should consider reviewing your plan. Take heart from recent changes in the regulations for neighbourhood plans that mean the review process is now simpler <p>I also said I would provide some information on how other Neighbourhood Plans have defined 'infill'. Some examples are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan – see Page 26, Policy H10 (plan attached) · Great Limber – see page 20, Policy 2 (plan attached) <p>Tatenhill and Rangemore include a definition of what they consider to be suitable infill, and this is defined as:</p>								<p>noted</p> <p>include in beginning of document</p>