



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

Barton-under-Needwood Parish Council Meeting – 03.03.2022

The Figures stated below incorporate the Policing Area known as "Needwood". This incorporates the villages of Barton-under-Needwood, Catholme, Rangemore, Tatenhill and Wychnor. All figures, unless stated otherwise, incorporate a twelve month period which in this instance captures data from 24/02/2021 to 24/02/2022.

Crime

Overall

24% increase this year compared to last year – 165 incidents last year to 205 incidents this year, an increase of 40 crimes.

Biggest Reductions – Top Three

Business Burglary – 12 incidents last year to 6 incidents this year

Residential Burglary – 10 incidents last year to 7 incidents this year

Drug Offences – 5 incidents last year to 4 incidents this year

Biggest Increase

There has been an increase of reports of Vehicle Interference. This has risen from 1 incident last year to 6 incidents this year.

Pattern or Trend

Local Hot Spot locations are still being patrolled regularly with special attention being paid to Public Houses and the nuisance that comes from patrons late at night. Concerns have been raised regarding the Policing of Public Houses, although very few official reports are being made. Encourage residents to follow the proper channels and contact Police directly via 999 or 101.

Contacting you PCSO via email is not the correct course of action for 999 calls.

Focused Crime Prevention advice

Attached is a link to a poster regarding techniques scammers use to gain access to your personal details

<file:///\\spsfssr4\\mydocs\\27951\\My%20Documents\\Scam-Courier-Fraud.pptx>

ASB

Overall

Reports of Anti-Social Behaviour have decreased over the year from 70 incidents last year to 45 incidents this year, a decrease of 36%.

Biggest Reduction

There has been a decrease in reports of Nuisance Communications – 1 incident last year to 0 incidents this year

Biggest Increase

There has been an increase in reports of Environmental Damage and Littering – 1 incident last year to 2 incidents this year

HOT Spot Locations

The following areas are being patrolled as per our current patrol plan: Holland Park Sports Club, adjacent car parks and drive ways, the fishpond, Collinson Road Park and Oak Road Shops are all being patrolled as part of our Anti-Social Behaviour Patrol Plan. Also the industrial estates / business premises are being regularly patrolled. Special attention is being paid to the local Public Houses due to concerns being raised by the public, although very few reports have been made officially to Police. Without official Police reports being made little action can be taken. Encourage residents to contact Police directly so that any available officer can deal with it as soon as possible, rather than waiting for a PCSO who may be off duty.

Community engagement

Contact details of the Ward Team are:-

- PCSO Tim Leathers – timothy.leathers@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk
- PC John MacDonald – john.macdonald@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk
- Sgt Helen Kirkland – helen.kirkland@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk

Smart Alert

Be SMART and Keep Updated – Get FREE, Localised Crime Alerts and Community Safety advice by utilising the Staffordshire Smart Alert App. This is available FREE and is available for both Apple and Android devices. You can also get Email alerts through the following website; www.staffordshiresmartalert.uk/staffs//

Digital 101

Digital 101 means that Members of the public can now report non-emergency incidents or make general enquires to Staffordshire Police through the force's main Twitter and Facebook accounts.

Staffordshire Police is one of the first forces to facilitate crime reporting through social media and this development supports the force's ongoing work to develop new and more convenient ways for the public to make contact with the police, anywhere, any time. It's also the latest development in the force's transformational programme, following the launch of its new operating model last summer.

Staffordshire Police is committed to providing the best possible service to the communities it serves and to delivering a modern police service reflective of modern-day needs.

The service launched on 4th March 2019 and is available to the public 7am – midnight, seven days a week. Members of the public can contact the force through its Facebook Account using the message facility or Facebook Messenger, Twitter users can Direct Message us via the Staffordshire Police Twitter Account @StaffsPolice

Barton under Needwood Parish Council - Receipts and Payments Summary
Item 6.1
2021-2022

Receipts	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total to Date
Rents	825.00	550.00	58.33	43.75	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,493.75
Interest	0.50	0.49	0.51	0.53	0.53	0.47	0.59	0.58	0.56	7.93	0.45	0.00	13.14
ESBC	31,937.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	31,937.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	63,875.98
Burial Ground	2,150.00	380.00	2,155.00	0.00	1,580.00	1,595.00	630.00	1,730.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	931.00	11,151.00
Fishpond	630.00	200.00	820.21	350.00	661.10	400.00	260.00	90.00	105.00	70.00	0.00	30.00	3,616.31
VAT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,246.65	0.00	8,246.65
Car Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,682.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,682.00
BVH Sal, Tax & NIC	544.57	586.49	575.17	593.93	600.95	684.01	572.77	543.97	1,144.49	1,168.17	942.86	0.00	7,957.38
Other	5.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.89
Grants/donations	0.00	0.00	14,500.00	25.00	10.00	0.00	500.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.00	799.61	0.00	17,834.61
Total Income	36,093.95	1,716.98	18,109.22	1,013.21	2,869.25	34,617.47	1,988.36	11,046.55	3,250.05	1,246.10	9,989.57	961.00	122,901.71

Payments													Total to Date
Bank Charges	11.25	7.85	23.25	24.10	0.00	8.95	17.60	16.55	11.10	14.70	13.00	0.00	148.35
Salaries & Wages	2,953.49	2,726.80	2,720.66	2,963.00	2,727.80	2,954.09	2,727.80	2,718.89	3,211.59	2,603.23	2,603.43	0.00	30,910.78
HMRC	951.66	1,129.60	1,029.80	1,014.82	1,178.36	1,042.52	1,290.64	1,039.34	1,003.34	1,411.48	1,135.81	0.00	12,227.37
Nest Pensions	256.81	280.51	258.68	258.70	280.51	258.68	280.51	258.68	258.68	301.51	259.82	0.00	2,953.09
Admin	746.82	275.85	2,877.62	642.25	89.99	894.66	708.68	1,327.04	305.62	570.00	19.80	0.00	8,458.33
Burial Ground	388.34	11.99	33.34	445.22	299.06	16.67	33.39	16.67	125.00	271.07	150.00	0.00	1,790.75
Allotments	0.00	0.00	38.38	13.94	223.82	0.00	0.00	125.00	0.00	0.00	238.63	0.00	639.77
Fishpond	718.55	782.50	0.00	521.48	133.16	300.00	560.25	112.50	0.00	122.26	77.80	0.00	3,328.50
Donations & S137	85.70	0.00	0.00	50.00	120.00	0.00	0.00	113.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	368.70
Parks & Open Spaces	414.23	1,502.63	902.85	3,492.85	1,127.76	1,765.41	1,111.12	1,092.85	120.18	80.00	80.00	0.00	11,689.88
Capital Expenditure	0.00	0.00	315.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,752.48	0.00	436.20	4,670.00	0.00	0.00	7,174.51
Maintenance & Repair	30.12	0.00	0.00	50.00	120.00	0.00	195.69	0.00	1,088.63	283.98	3,950.00	0.00	5,718.42
Car Park	118.47	75.28	71.28	89.10	327.40	89.10	71.28	221.28	89.10	71.28	71.28	0.00	1,294.85
Lengthsmen	82.00	65.60	65.60	82.00	65.60	200.56	245.29	160.40	272.76	178.20	178.20	0.00	1,596.21
General payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	89.45	0.00	20.00	0.00	139.45
Projects	16,891.00	972.60	0.00	175.80	0.00	819.00	237.00	8,819.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	27,914.40
VAT	3,502.06	580.77	372.18	841.64	278.84	639.48	723.94	487.33	139.98	993.94	834.50	0.00	9,394.66
Total Spend	27,150.50	8,411.98	8,709.47	10,664.90	7,002.30	8,989.12	9,955.67	16,508.53	7,151.63	11,571.65	9,632.27	0.00	125,748.02

Barton under Needwood Parish Council - Budgets vs Actuals 2021-2022

Item 6.1

[illegible]

Barton under Needwood Parish Council			Bank Reconciliation as per statements at:		01-Mar-22
Lloyds Current A/C			£	1,970.00	
Lloyds Deposit (Instant Access) A/C			£	48,597.57	
National Savings			£	73,853.99	
Petty Cash			£	150.00	
Total Bank Balances					£ 124,571.56
<u>Add Credits not on Statement</u>					
				£0.00	£ 124,571.56
<u>Less unrepresented payments:-</u>					
				£0.00	£ 124,571.56
<u>Opening Balances :-</u>			<u>Bank Statements as at 31st March 2021</u>		
Lloyds Current A/C		£	2,001.00		
Lloyds Deposit A/C		£	56,534.85		
National Savings		£	73,846.60		
Petty Cash		£	150.00		
Parish Council -			Total	£ 132,532.45	
<i>Add Receipts to date</i>		£	123,805.71		
<i>Less Expenditure to date</i>		£	131,766.60		
Total Cash and Investments as at -				£ 124,571.56	
				<u>Difference</u>	£ 0.00
RFO, S. Rumsby					

Barton under Needwood Parish Council - Scheduled Payments presented to Full Council

Item 6.1

		£	£	£
Payee		Value Gross	VAT	NET
Salaries total		3,674.28		3,674.28
Nest		259.82		259.82
HMRC		1,054.73		1,054.73
Mitmark	Collinson park CCTV	96.00	16.00	80.00
SSE	Electricity Fishpond	77.80		77.80
Danny Boulter	Site Clearance (P&OS)	280.00		280.00
SCC	Allotment rent	1,550.00	0.00	1,550.00
Hulls Environmental	Pest Treatment Fishpond	112.50		112.50
Burton Skip Hire	Burial Ground	150.00	25.00	150.00
Total Net Payments				7,239.13

PLANNING – All matters have been referred to the Planning Committee and their comments appear in italics below, the Committee meet fortnightly 5pm, in the Douglas Room, Barton Village Hall. Please contact the clerk for dates should you wish to attend any Planning Meetings

1. 01664 - 7 Holly Road : Erection of a single storey side and front extension including pitched roof over existing flat roof – *no objections*
2. 00048 - Land South of the Junction of Small Meadows and Dunstall Road : Permission in Principle for two dwellings
This is an application for permission in principle for this site which lies to the north of Barton Hall and is bounded by Dunstall Road to the west and Small Meadows to the north. The proposal is for two, two storey houses.
 - 1.1 *This planning application for a 'permission in principle' is one we have not come across before. Introduced in 2017, according to the government's website, it is an alternative route to gaining planning permission which separates matters of principle from technical detail. If permission in principle is agreed, then the technical details follow. It seems to be intended for small amounts of housing development, as in this case, and also for sites on brownfield land registers. Local Planning Authorities have five weeks to determine such applications. The normal approach is to submit an outline planning application where an applicant can just draw a red line around a site to establish whether the proposed use of land is acceptable in principle before submitting a full and detailed planning application. The main difference is that, with permission in principle, we are restricted to commenting on location, land use and amount of development.*
 - 1.2 *Legislation dictates that you determine planning applications in accordance with the Development Plan – in this case the Local Plan - unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The planning application provides no indication of any material considerations other than it states that the land is vacant. We do not know if this is being put forward as a material consideration but, just because it is vacant, does not provide sufficient grounds to justify the principle of residential development. There appears to be no evidence that the site has previously been developed so we assume that it is not brownfield land.*

Policy SP 8 Development outside settlement boundaries

 - 2.1 *The site lies outside, although immediately adjoining the northern limit of the settlement boundary for the village. This defines the limits for development making the general assumption that development within the settlement boundary is acceptable in principle. Development outside the settlement boundary is regarded as being in the countryside where restrictions apply.*
 - 2.2 *The settlement boundary along Dunstall Road is defined fairly generously on its eastern side as it includes the curtilage and grounds of Barton Hall. A much tighter boundary could have been drawn to include the buildings but to exclude the grounds to the north and the east. Such a definition might have better reflected the tightness of the built-up nature of the village and its abrupt relationship with the open countryside. Inclusion of the curtilage, however, demonstrates the character of development in this area which consists of large properties on substantial plots.*
 - 2.3 *Development outside the settlement boundary is governed by Policy SP 8. Development here will not be permitted unless it is for such things as being essential to support the viability of an existing local business, providing facilities for the local community, being necessary to secure a significant improvement in the landscape and being otherwise appropriate in the countryside. If any of these criteria are met, then there is another set of hoops to go through. These include issues such as development must not affect the amenities of existing residents, not introduce a considerable urban form and development being out of character with the surrounding area. Proximity to a settlement is a consideration but under this criterion any proposal should not create an unacceptable urban extension.*
 - 2.4 *We cannot see that this proposal meets any of this first set of criteria. We would suggest that the landscape in this location is not degraded and so there can be no justification on those grounds. From our experience the limits to development have proved to be an effective delineation between the built form of the village and the open countryside. No land use justification is given for wanting to extend development on this eastern side of Dunstall Road. Residential use is not one which would fall into the category of being otherwise appropriate in the countryside.*
 - 2.5 *If the first set has not been met then we assume that this second set of criteria does not come into play. For the avoidance of doubt, however, we also address these secondary issues. As revealed in the Conservation Area Appraisal – see below – the nature of development in this particular location area is one of large properties on substantial plots. As such we feel that development on the proposed site would provide an unacceptable and unwarranted extension of development into the open countryside. It would, therefore, affect the amenities enjoyed by existing land users and be*

incompatible with the character of the surrounding area. The open nature of the site immediately to the north of Barton Hall also means that the site relates to the open countryside rather than to the built form of Barton, notwithstanding the Small Meadows boundary. The site provides an important gateway to the village and as such should remain undeveloped in order to protect the countryside location, the character of the area and the visual amenity of existing land users.

2.6 We object to the principle of development and, therefore, any amount of development on the proposed site as it would be contrary to Policy SP 8 for development in the open countryside.

Policy SP25 Historic Environment and Policy DP 5 Protecting the Historic Environment

3.1 The red line boundary on the applicant's proposal plan demonstrates that not only does it adjoin the settlement boundary but also the Conservation Area. The Conservation Area is defined here by the rounded driveway into The Deer House and also the verges and hedgerows on the western side of Dunstall Road. Barton Hall and the Deer House are also listed buildings.

3.2 Both these policies – SP25 and DP5 - aim to protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets and these include listed buildings, the conservation area and their settings. Any new development within or adjacent to the conservation area, for example, will need to respect the existing character in terms of scale, form, materials and detailing. Key views into and out of the conservation area, identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal, have to remain uninhibited.

3.3 With that last issue in mind, it is noticeable that the Conservation Area Appraisal (page 23) includes a photograph, looking north west, taken from what looks like the driveway into The Deer House. This photograph amply demonstrates the point we were making above that views here look outward towards the countryside rather than inwards to the village.

3.4 According to the Appraisal, the eastern side of Dunstall Road is characterised as much by its green spaces as by its buildings. The properties are large and being built on spacious plots appear quite grand. The Appraisal notes that the character of this part of the conservation area is distinct. The larger plots with houses set back from the road provide a sense of wealth and importance. The Appraisal also notes that the space between properties is almost as important as the buildings themselves for defining the special interest of the area.

3.5 The Appraisal also identifies both sides of the Dunstall Road frontage as providing important trees and green spaces (Fig 2). On its eastern side, this provides the setting for Barton Hall and includes the Deer House. Although the application site is not included in this designation, the Appraisal provides sufficient evidence to justify their retention and to resist development that might affect the special quality of this area. To our minds this designation just adds to the need to ensure the setting of the conservation area and its associated listed buildings.

3.6 We have no details of any proposed design and it appears from the terms of reference for such permission in principle applications that we are not allowed to comment on such things. Be that as it may, we believe that the eulogizing within the Conservation Area Appraisal would seem to dictate that open views into and out of the conservation area should be maintained and that sense of grandness should also be retained for the sake of the setting of both the conservation area and the listed buildings. Within that context any development will create an undesirable extension to what is a clearly defined limit to the urban form of Barton and, therefore, we cannot see that any residential development could be acceptable in principle.

3.7 We object to the principle of development on this site as being incompatible with the need to protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets. Key views into and out of the conservation area would also be compromised. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SP 25 and DP5.

3. P/2019/01494 - Unit 2 Bell Lane : Appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the conversion and alterations to existing workshops to form 2 no residential dwellings including two dormer windows to Plot 2 and rooflights to front and rear of Plot 1 and bin store – Notice of Appeal APP/B3410/W/ 21/3285069 – Response submitted 17.2.22 :

We understand that our representation on the planning application has already been forwarded to you. We wish that objection to stand, but having read the Appellant's Appeal Statement, we wanted to take issue on a particular point.

As we said in our submission, the East Staffordshire Borough Council Local Plan designated Barton under Needwood as both a

“Strategic Village” and a “Rural Centre”. The aim of a strategic village was to meet rural needs by providing a good range of services and facilities. Similarly, a rural centre is defined as offering a basic level of shopping and service function for the village and immediate hinterland. The Rural Centre is identified by a small green diamond shape on the Barton under Needwood Proposals Map. The Rural Centre is not defined by any boundaries or street frontages but by this symbol placed on Main Street at the junctions with Bell Lane/Crowberry Lane. We, therefore, assume that the designation is intended to apply to the principal and existing retail, commercial and service area in the village. It is not uncommon in villages like Barton to have these functions located immediately behind the street frontages, so we have assumed that the Rural Centre designation also applies to the appeal site.

In a number of paragraphs the appellants refer to the site being a non-conforming use or in one case, possibly for a bit of variety, a “contextually inappropriate use”! (para 6.1). Bearing in mind the definition and purpose of the Rural Centre was to provide a shopping and service function, then we find it hard to square this definition with the appellant’s assertion that the existing use is non-conforming. Surely the former Country Services Store, which undertook repairs and sales, in any common sense definition, provided a service to the local community and its rural hinterland? How can this use be non-conforming in this location, especially when the rural centre designation boundary is undefined? If there is any non-conformity, then surely it is to do with introducing a residential use into this generally commercial area. If the appellants feel that shops, commercial opportunities and services should not be allowed on this site, then where are they meant to be located in order to meet the Local Plan designation?

One of the main reasons for our objection is that, over the last few years, we had become concerned at the loss of commercial opportunities to residential use along Main Street and consequently within the Rural Centre. It is this loss of the commercial opportunity that this location provides that we are most concerned about. If the conversion is allowed then, unfortunately, we feel this will lead to the further erosion of its Local Plan role as a Strategic Village and Rural Centre. We cannot help but think that the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework July 2021 (para 84) appeal to planning policies and decisions to retain local services and facilities was precisely intended for situations such as this.

4. 00087 - 24 Fullbrook Avenue : Erection of a front porch and single storey rear annexe extension – *no objections*
5. 00059 - 26 Beech Road : Demolition of existing porch to facilitate the erection of a single story front extension, replacement of all windows/doors and installation of cladding to the front and rear elevations – *no objections*
6. TPO 434 – Rear of 74 Wales Lane, adj 11a Westmead Road : T1 Holly
7. 00129 - The Hollies, Short Lane : Erection of a part two storey, part single storey front extension –
Whilst the proposed extension in our view improves the overall appearance of the building we do have concerns. It is a substantial forward projection from the existing building line which if granted could set a precedent for further substantial forward projecting extensions to other nearby premises which would have a detrimental impact on the local landscape character of the area.
8. 00196 - 5 Wharf Houses : Reduce back to original pollard points of 1 Willow tree and reduce upper crown by up to 2 metres with shape of 1 Cherry tree
These trees are fully visible from both the public road and canal towpath and are a significant component of the visual amenity of the area. This application contains no information as to why this work is necessary now and states they are neither diseased nor a danger to property.
Whilst question 10 of the application form only requires such specific answers for trees subject to a TPO the fact that planning consent is required in a conservation area implies that it should only be granted where there is a reason for this.
As we seen no justification for this work we object to the application in its current form.

ESBC Decisions – Permissions Granted

1. 01596 - 43 Fallowfield Drive : Demolition of existing garage to facilitate the erection of a single storey side extension and front porch
2. 01320 - 102 Captains Lane : Erection of a first floor side, two storey front and part two storey and single storey rear extension
3. 01396 - 117 Main Street : Erection of a replacement dwelling
4. 00049 - Castle House , 33 Station Road : Felling of 1 Yew tree, reduce height to 5 metres and reduce spread by up to 1 metre all round of 2 Yew trees, reduce height to 8 metres and reduce spread by up to 1 metre all round of 1 Yew tree, reduce height to 4 metres of 3 Holly trees and reduction in height to 5 metres and reduce spread to 1.5 metres all round from trunk of 1 Yew tree
5. 01505 - Errisbeg House, Barton Turn : Erection of a cabin to be used as a dog grooming salon (Sui Generis)
6. 01664 - 7 Holly Road : Erection of a single storey side and front extension including pitched roof over existing flat roof

ESBC Decisions – Refused

1. 01652 - Land rear of 8 Arden Road : Erection of a single storey detached dwelling

SCC Decisions – Permission Granted

1. Planning application No. ES.20/06/501 MW Application to vary (not to comply with) conditions 8 and 17 of planning permission ES.20/03/501 MW to facilitate an increase in the site's output from 1 million tonnes to 1.4 million tonnes per year by extending the hours of operation for mineral extraction and processing from 1900 to 2200 Monday to Friday, extending the hours for the maintenance of processing plant from 0600 to 2000 Monday to Saturday to 24 hours/day Monday to Saturday and permitting up to 5 lorries associated with the on-site mineral operations to enter the site and park overnight after 1900 Monday to Friday and after 1600 on Saturdays at Newbold Quarry

MINUTES from FISH POND Meeting:

Present: Jeannette Taylor, Ian Gilbey, Simon Derby and Mark Jackson.

Discussion: Pricing of Fishing Tickets.

It was felt that our ticket price needed to be increased.

It was decided that the SEASON TICKET would rise to: £45. for ADULTS.

Concessions will rise to: £25.

DAY TICKETS:

Will rise to: £12. for ADULTS.

Concessions: £6.

This will be reviewed again in Two Years.

Will put the new prices on all social media that we use.

NEW tickets will start to be issued in MARCH.

Jeannette Taylor

28/2/22

MINUTES OF BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL – BURIAL GROUND COMMITTEE MEETING held 14 February 2022 – 10am

At Barton Village Hall

Present: -

Cllr L Bennett (Chairman) Cllr G Hughes

Cllrs S van Daesdonk Cllr I Gilbey

Mrs S Rumsby (Clerk)

1. [Unsafe Memorials](#)

Notices had been displayed on graves in December regarding unsafe memorials. 5 relatives had approached Shortstone Memorials to carry out necessary repairs to make safe. The Clerk had established that the quotes given per memorial had all been around the £270 mark to refix with new dowels and anchor system. Alan Cannell is the stonemason who would be carrying out the work for Shortstones.

The Committee estimated the cost of making all the stones safe including the ones who had already received quotes which would be circa £5-6k.

Stapenhill cemetery have taken the approach to lay the stones down and leave as they are.

The Committee discussed the option to fix the flat stones into the ground, however some have a lip for vases and would need advice from Alan Cannell as to how easy it would be to remove this section. We would also take advice from our gravedigger Mark Rigway on how far down any cremated remains interred were. Clerk to contact Stapenhill Cemetery to find out how they have treated the stones they have laid flat.

Following advice sought, the Committee would reconvene to decide how to handle the unsafe memorials.

2. [Government Proposal for increasing the area of grave spaces](#) – it was understood NALC were campaigning for full consultation on this which would dramatically reduce the lifespan of the burial ground's remaining space.

3. [Fees](#)

The Burial Ground fees had not been reviewed for 2 years and it was decided the new rates were recommended as attached to be effective from 1 April 2022.

It is proposed full Council resolve to note the Minutes of the Burial Ground Committee meeting and accept the above recommendations.

Barton under Needwood Parish Council	
Burial Ground Charges	01/04/2022 2022
<u>For Interment in a Common Grave</u>	
	£
Child	0
Adult	550
<u>For Interment with purchase of the 'Exclusive Right of Burial'</u>	
Single Width Grave	750
Double Width Grave	750
Cremated Remains Space	350
<i>Plus</i>	
For each interment or re-opening of an existing double grave -	
Adult	550
For interment of Cremated Remains	175
In the case of a burial of a child, or stillborn infant, no charges are made for the burial, grave space or introduction of the memorial.	
<u>Memorial Wall and Scattering of Cremated Remains</u>	
Scattering of Cremated Remains in Memorial Garden and single sized plaque on Memorial Wall	375
Scattering of Cremated Remains in Memorial Garden 1 + 1 reserved and double sized plaque on Memorial Wall (4 lines of inscription per scattering)	450
Additional Inscription on Double sized plaque (further 4 lines of inscription)	165
<u>For the erection of Memorials etc</u>	
Headstone	275
Tablet (Cremated Remains)	275
Additional Inscription	80
<u>S. Rumsby - Clerk to the Council</u>	
15/02/2022	

BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL –

BURIAL GROUND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Unsafe Memorials – Update 1/3/22

Committee members and the Clerk met with Alan Cannell the stonemason to review the remaining unsafe memorials.

Alan again offered some very knowledgeable and common-sense advice. The NAMM regulations which require the ground support anchor apply to new headstones only and also where a headstone is being reinstalled with a second inscription. Having looked at the stones involved, some are not thick enough for the ground anchor so even more expense would be incurred to achieve this. Alan is now suggesting that the most sensible option is to effectively put them back as they had originally been installed, ie. lift them upright again and re-cement the base to the headstone. This is how they would have been installed originally and before the NAMM regs. Then after 3 months the topple test would be carried out on those stones and they will be as solid as any others installed in this way. Technically, as a stonemason, any they re-fix should really be done to NAMM standards but he cannot see anything wrong in putting them back the way they would have been as the headstones were originally installed before the regulations came into effect. We would take full responsibility if there was any come back on this point but Alan suggested that as the stones would be safe again and exactly as the others are around them, it would be very unlikely. He just requires a letter to say we want him to reinstall the stones as they were.

Some discussion had taken place around re-cementing the stones ourselves with volunteer help. Whilst it does seem straight forward, there are risks involved in handling the stones when working with them. They are **extremely** heavy and have to be rocked back and forth to apply the cement. Alan has therefore offered re-fixing all unsafe memorials by cementing them back in as shown for £40 per stone. Each slab would be levelled, the headstone bases would be cemented back to the slab and pointed in and cleaned up. Where there is a flower vase, the pointing is left so the water can seap out. In the odd one or two cases the headstone has also become loose from the base so this would be re-fixed as well. He won't charge extra for those.

This would be a cheaper option than burying flat or indeed burying the base into the ground as he had previously suggested. The other advantage of this course of action is that if any relatives come forward, and want to have the stone re-fixed with the ground anchor system, it will be easy to separate again. If the work is not done correctly, it may be difficult to rectify.

Recommendation

Having considered the matter fully, the Burial Ground Committee propose that the best option would be to have the unsafe memorials re-fixed professionally by Cannell Memorials – bases would be levelled, re-cemented, pointed and cleaned for £40 per stone x 19 memorials. It would take on average of an hour per stone and two people are required. Local funeral directors, memorial services use Cannells as the local stonemason.

CORRESPONDENCE *as circulated to Council*

7.1. GENERAL

- 7.1.1. Residents concerns re planning application P/2021/01502 Dunstall Farm Shop, *our lodged comments forwarded.*
- 7.1.2. Residents concerns re diversion of PROW 17 – *Cllr Sharkey responded*
- 7.1.3. Resident concerns re blocked gullies at Barton Gate – *Clerk responded*
- 7.1.4. Barton Lodge concerns re parking on their site at school peak times – *Clerk responded*
- 7.1.5. Correspondence with Church Lane resident regarding boundary fencing to Collinson Park.

7.2. SCC/HIGHWAYS

- 7.2.1. Cllr Jessel: reports and communications
- 7.2.2. Acknowledgment from John Tradewell re bottom of Gilmour Lane

7.3. ESBC

- 7.3.1. Response from Naomi Perry re residents' concerns on the process of lodging objections to a planning application.
- 7.3.2. Notification from Planning Policy Officer on Windfall Sites - 20 properties counted from the 25 allocated for Barton period 2012 - 2031

7.4. POLICE

- 7.4.1. Report

7.5. SPCA/NALC/SLCC

- 7.5.1. SPCA – Newsletters, training circulars