

EAST STAFFORDSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

DRAFT DETAILED SCHEDULE OF ISSUES

Notes

- *This Schedule is expanded from the Provisional version previously circulated. Only one additional item has been included – Education – numbered 9A to avoid altering the numbering of other items.*
- *This Schedule may be subject to further modification after the PHM. A final version will be issued at about the end of September.*
- *As part of the consideration of the Issues and Matters for discussion listed below, due attention will be given the Main Modifications (MMs) to the Plan now proposed by the Council [in Document F.17 as at 18 August 2014] as to whether they are necessary and sufficient, with or without further modification, to make the Plan sound.*

1. Duty to Co-operate

Does the Plan and its preparation comply with the statutory Duty to Co-operate with prescribed bodies regarding cross-boundary strategic matters, including housing requirements in particular?

2. Legal Compliance

Is the Plan otherwise legally compliant including with respect to the:

- a. public consultation process and the Statement of Community Involvement,
- b. Revised Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment/Appropriate Assessment,
- c. Local Development Scheme, and
- d. relevant Act and Regulations?

3. Relationship of the Local Plan to Development and Supplementary Planning Documents (DPDs and SPDs) and Neighbourhood Plans

Is the ESLP effective in relying upon, or deferring to, other plans or policy documents, in particular:

- a. a potential future site allocation Development Plan Document,
 - b. Neighbourhood Plans, and
 - c. Supplementary Planning Document on Housing Choice,
- taking into account the progress of their preparation and the level and nature of objection being encountered.

4. Overall Spatial Strategy

Is the overall Spatial Strategy of the Plan sound including respect to the Options considered and:

- a. the Settlement Hierarchy and the broad location and distribution of development in relation to:

- i. Rolleston on Dove,
 - ii. Marchington, *and*
 - iii. *others as necessary*
- b. Strategic Sites and Strategic Urban Extensions and:
 - i. whether these two designations and their respective functions are sufficiently distinct,
 - ii. whether the identified SUEs are necessary and appropriately designated, and
 - iii. whether additional SUEs should be designated.
- c. Green Gaps and:
 - i. whether these are necessary,
 - ii. detailed designation of their boundaries.
- d. Designation of settlement boundaries, including at
 - i. Abbots Bromley,
 - ii. Denstone,
 - iii. Draycott,
 - iv. Marchington,
 - v. Yoxall, *and*
 - vi. *others as necessary*
- e. The degree of constraint upon development or redevelopment outside settlements.

5. Flood Risk and Climate Change

Does the Plan and its Evidence Base robustly make appropriate provision for:

- a. flood risk and the application of the sequential and exception tests of national policy and guidance,
- b. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, and
- c. any other aspects of climate change?

6. Housing Need and Requirement

Is the requirement for the provision of housing identified in the Plan:

- a. soundly based on an Objective Assessment of Need for market and affordable housing,
- b. based on an appropriately defined Housing Market Area,
- c. to provide an appropriate mix of size and type of dwelling, including Extra Care accommodation?

7. Housing Land Supply

Is there robust evidence that the development locations and sites allocated in the Plan, together with windfall sites:

- a. can deliver the requisite number of market and affordable dwellings across the Borough in addition to current committed supply¹, and
- b. will maintain a minimum five year housing land supply at all times, and
- c. that the housing trajectory is realistic?

¹ Current committed supply necessarily includes several sites originally allocated in the Plan but now permitted and not subject to further consideration in this Examination.

8. Affordable Housing Provision and Exception Sites

- a. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for developer contributions toward an identified need for affordable housing:
 - i. based on robust evidence of viability across the Borough,
 - ii. including with reference to consideration of the content of the Housing Choice SPD and representations made upon it during recent public consultation, and
 - iii. are MMs 24 to 28 to Strategic Policy 17 and its supporting text now proposed necessary and sufficient to make the Plan sound in this respect?
- b. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for residential development including affordable housing on Exception Sites?

9. Employment Development

Does the Plan make sound provision for sufficient, appropriately located Employment sites?

9A Education Development

Does the Plan make sound provision for Education development?

10. Retail Development

Does the Plan make sound provision for Retail development?

11. Tourism and Leisure development

Does the Plan make sound provision for Tourism and Leisure Development?

12. Infrastructure Provision

Is there robust viability and other evidence that the infrastructure necessary to support the development allocated in the Plan will be provided at the appropriate time with particular respect to:

- a. Highways and Transportation
- b. Healthcare facilities
- c. Education facilities
- d. Sports and Leisure facilities and Open Space

13. Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Does the Plan make appropriate provision for sites to accommodate Gypsies and Travellers on robust up to date evidence of need?

14. Development Management Policies

Does the Plan include appropriate policies for development management?

continued on page 4

15. Development Locations, Individual Sites and Villages

Are the individual development locations and sites allocated by the Plan selected on the basis of robust evidence of suitability, availability and deliverability for development for the uses identified at the appropriate time having regard to likely planning impacts?

Note

Where allocated sites have received planning permission since the submission of the Plan these will only be considered with respect to their contribution to housing land supply.

Sites to be discussed as necessary depending on representations made during pre-submission public consultation and requests to appear:

Burton upon Trent

- a. Bargates Molson Coors, High St (361/383) including:
 - i. definition of site(s),
 - ii. masterplan requirements, and
 - iii. deliverability.
- b. Molson Coors Middle Yd, Hawkins La (29/378)
- c. Derby Road (88/343/359/360/381) including:
 - i. extent of site and development content,
 - ii. viability,
 - iii. deliverability.
- d. Branston Locks (44)
if not approved as resolved
- e. Tutbury Rd, Harehedge La (40/41/376)
if not approved

Uttoxeter

- f. Brookside Indust Est (33) including:
 - i. loss of employment,
 - ii. flood risk.
- g. Hazelwalls (53):
 - i. greenfield landscape impact,
 - ii. traffic impact, access and road safety,
 - iii. impact on local community facilities, education etc,
 - iv. flood risk,
 - v. effect on wildlife,
 - vi. overall sustainability.
- h. Derby Road (372)
- i. Uttoxeter West (42/48/55)
if not approved as resolved

Villages

- j. *South of Rocester* (112) including:
 - i. flood risk.
- k. *College Fields*, Rolleston on Dove (66)
if not allowed at appeal

Development Allowances

each village in turn as necessary

- a. Amount of allowance in each Tier 1 and 2 Village,
- b. whether Tier 3 villages should have individual allowances.

Note

*Where **alternative (omission) sites** have been put forward, these will be added for discussion at a later date as necessary.*

B J Sims
5 September 2014