

BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL

Localism Act 2011

I,

having been elected to the office of BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL as Chairman on 5 May 2022 declare that I take office upon myself and will duly and faithfully fulfil the duties of it to the best of my judgement and ability.

Signed Date

This declaration was made and signed before me, Siobhan Rumsby

Signed Date.....

Proper Officer of Barton under Needwood Parish Council

Barton under Needwood Parish Council -Appointment of Officers to Committees
(Chairman a member of all Committees)

Committee	Officers Elected 2022-2023
Finance	G. Hughes, A. Jones, D. Lord, J. Taylor, L. Young Meet quarterly
Planning	I Gilbey, D. Lord, E. Sharkey, J. Taylor, J. Weaver, L. Young, Co-option: R. Bell Meet fortnightly Mondays 5pm – Committee has delegated responsibilities to comment on applications due to time scales.
Sub Committee -Strategic Planning	E. Sharkey + other Cllrs called as required when needed dependant on issue Co-option: Roger Bell
Sub Committee - Rural Services Network	I Gilbey + Co-option R. Bell
Human Resources including Health & Safety & Emergency Planning Safeguarding Officer	L. Bennett, G. Hughes, A. Jones + Clerk Meet as required A Jones, S. Severn + Clerk
Allotments	L. Bennett, G. Hughes, D. Lord Meet on site as required
Burial Ground	L. Bennett, I. Gilbey, G. Hughes, J. Weaver + Clerk Meet as required
Parks and Open Areas: Collinson Park, Ash Tree Pocket Park, Gilmour Lane, Fishpond St James Garden	I Gilbey, S. Severn, E. Sharkey, J. Taylor, L. Young Meet as required Chris Alcock to be Co-opted special projects (signs) Other volunteers for projects as and when needed
Village Enhancement	A Jones, J. Taylor, L. Young Meet as required Co-option: volunteers for special projects as and when needed.
Outside Bodies Representatives:	
Holland Sports Club	A. Jones, J. Taylor, J. Weaver + Clerk Cllr attendance required once every 3 months
Quarries Liaison	S. Severn, E. Sharkey
Barton & Dunstall Key Trust	S. van Daesdonk
School Governors	Thomas Russell Juniors: no vacancies
Special Responsibilities:	
Communications inc website, Chime and social media	A Jones, E. Sharkey, S. van Daesdonk, L. Young + Clerk Meet as required
Fishpond	I Gilbey, J. Taylor Meet as required
Speedwatch	A Jones
Flagpole	Co-option: G Taylor, Rev A Simpson
Cheque Signatories	6 : Clerk, L Bennett; G Hughes, E Sharkey, J Taylor, S van Daesdonk
Internal Auditor	Alan Toplis
Flood Risk Group	D. Lord, E. Sharkey, S. van Daesdonk
Family Festival	L. Young

Committees

Chairman to be appointed at next meeting of the Committee, Clerk to be notified.

Review and update Terms of Reference for Committees to be sent to the Clerk following next Committee meeting.

Committees share the workload and with detailed reports including clear proposals/recommendations resulting in shorter full Council meetings.

Councillors can direct their individual skills to relevant Committees but this should not limit or exclude other Councillors' experience.

Rotating Councillors on different Committees can have the benefit of bringing in a fresh pair of eyes, new enthusiasm.

Balancing number of councillors to each Committee eases the pressures of Council work, enables newer Councillors to get involved more

Keeping one or two existing members on a Committee whilst encouraging rotation of committee members ensures continuity of knowledge within the Council as a whole and allows Councillors to keep abreast of all workings of the Council

PULLING TOGETHER

Diversity often arises because councillors have different backgrounds, enthusiasms and interests. We should celebrate this. Councillors have different skills and attitudes; for example, some work with ideas while others are very practical; some like accounts while others prefer reports. The local council needs a range of skills to work as a team.



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

Barton-under-Needwood Parish Council Meeting – 05.05.2022

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 29/04/2021 to 29/04/2022.

Crime

Overall

38% increase this year compared to last year – 156 incidents last year to 216 incidents this year, an increase of 60 crimes

Biggest Reductions – Top Three

Business Robbery – 1 incident last year to 0 incidents this year

Other Offences – 7 incidents last year to 1 incident this year

Business Burglary – 13 incidents last year to 5 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

There have been no recent patterns or trends in this rural area. Regular patrols are carried out along all roads and Hot Spot Locations. Targeted patrols are taking place in various location around Barton to counter specific but unrelated incidents.

Focused Crime Prevention advice

Phishing on Social Media

In the context of Instagram or other social media, someone might send you a suspicious message or link that asks for personal information. These messages could try to scare you by claiming your account will be banned or deleted if you don't follow their directions.

Another phishing method on Instagram could be through spoofed login page in fake apps or websites. These apps might promise to manage a user's social media account.

How to avoid getting phished?

- Look out for suspicious emails or messages
- Don't click suspicious links
- Don't respond to these emails
- Create a secure password using ThreeRandomWords and a combination of numbers, symbols and cases
- Turn on two-factor authentication / two-step authentication

When creating or updating a password remember, the longer the better.

Recovering a hacked account

- Update your devices
- Contact your provider

If your email account was hacked

- Change passwords
- Set up two-factor authentication
- Notify your contacts
- If you decide to make a new account, be sure to notify your contacts
- Contact Action Fraud

Reporting an incident

If you think your online account has been hacked, report it. Action Fraud is the main fraud and cybercrime reporting service in the UK. You should also report to the social media account provider. The more reports we receive, the more effective the service. Cybercrime changes almost daily so only by receiving reports from the public can we begin to counter it.

Do you think you're details have been hacked or you are getting a lot of bogus phone calls? Go to haveibeenpwned.com (not a typo). Type in an email address or phone number to check. This will then search the internet to see if those details are known. If they are, don't panic. Change your password immediately and check your security settings.

ASB

Overall

Reports of Anti-Social Behaviour have decreased over the year from 61 incidents last year to 47 incidents this year, a decrease of 23%.

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 Drugs Related ASB – 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, Oak Road Shops, short-cuts around Fallowfield Drive and the brook, and Barton. The industrial estates and more rural access around the village are utilised on an almost daily basis to assist in patrolling more remote areas.

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

Item 7.1

[illegible]

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

Item 7.1

		£	£	£	
Payee		Value Gross	VAT	NET	
Salaries total		3,800.40		3,800.40	
Nest		175.05		175.05	
HMRC		1,201.40		1,201.40	
Mitmark	Collinson park CCTV	96.00	16.00	80.00	
Country Services	Petrol and safety glasses	69.38	11.55	57.83	
Bullfinch	Beacon Repairs estimate	200.00		200.00	£84 prof forma invoice received £200 applied from Key Trust + £80 for gas
John Taylor High School	Donation towards prizes	25.00		25.00	Annual presentation evening
Zoom (Cancel)	Annual Pro membership	119.90	19.98	99.92	cancel
Zurich	Insurance Renewal 5 yr deal	1,880.55		1,880.55	One quote awaited from BHIB, AXA declined as too complex, approve up to £1880.55
S Gaynor	Summer Planting	450.00		450.00	
Sam Turner & Sons	BG 86 C-E Blower	285.00	47.50	237.50	Item Approved at previous meeting but M Bennett temporarily fixed
					Strimmer also required to be sourced, both vibrating
Total Net Payments				8,207.65	

Barton under Needwood Parish Council			Bank Reconciliation as per statements at:			03-May-22
Lloyds Current A/C			£	2,000.00		
Lloyds Deposit (Instant Access) A/C			£	78,902.31		
National Savings			£	73,853.99		
Petty Cash			£	150.00		
Total Bank Balances						£ 154,906.30
<u>Add Credits not on Statement</u>						
					£0.00	£ 154,906.30
<u>Less unrepresented payments:-</u>						
					£0.00	£ 154,906.30
<u>Opening Balances :-</u>			<u>Bank Statements as at 31st March 2021</u>			
Lloyds Current A/C			£	2,001.00		
Lloyds Deposit A/C			£	43,546.83		
National Savings			£	73,853.99		
Petty Cash			£	150.00		
Parish Council -			Total	£ 119,551.82		
<i>Add Receipts to date</i>			£	42,807.34		
<i>Less Expenditure to date</i>			£	7,452.86		
Total Cash and Investments as at -				£ 154,906.30		
					Difference	£ -
RFO, S. Rumsby						

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. 00310 - 9 Fullbrook Avenue : Erection of a single storey front/side extension

Whilst we have no objection to this proposal in principle we do note that the store extension along the side of the dwelling would block out light to the kitchen through an existing window. Policy DP 3 states proposals would normally be permitted where, "the development would not result in a material loss of light to principal windows". A site visit by a planning officer may be necessary to clarify the significance of this loss of natural light and advise whether this constitutes a principal window as defined in the policy.

2. 00352 – 90 Station Road : Erection of single storey rear and side extension

This is a proposal for a single storey flat roof, rear and part side, extension of a tall three storey (at least at the rear) semi-detached property on the south side of Station Road, near the eastern entrance to the village. The proposal appears to build over the former patio and reconfigures the kitchen and family room into family/dining/kitchen area. The property lies within the Conservation Area.

Parish Council Comments

1.1 We feel that the appropriate policies to determine this application are Policy SP 24 High Quality Design, SP 25 Historic Environment and DP 5 Protecting the historic environment.

Policy SP 24 High Quality Design

1.2 This policy states that all development must contribute positively to the area in which they are proposed and help create a sense of place, building on local character and respecting local patterns of development. Developers are required to demonstrate how they have responded to the criteria in this policy and the ESBC's Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Policy SP 25 Historic Environment

1.3 Development proposals should protect, preserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings taking account of their significance as well as their distinctive character. Proposals should use high quality design as stipulated in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and ESBC's Design Guide

Policy DP5 Protecting the historic environment

1.4 The aim of this policy is to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets where new development proposals will be expected to make a positive contribution to the fabric and integrity of existing buildings. New development proposals within the historic environment including conservation areas must respect their context, character and appearance in terms of using sound design principles as articulated in the Design SPD. In conservation areas, in particular, development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it would protect and enhance its character and appearance

Policy Discussion

2.1 Policy SP 24 states that all proposals must contribute positively to the area. They also need to demonstrate how they have responded to this criterion and made use of the ESBC Design Guide. There is nothing in the accompanying documents which demonstrate that they have done this and there is certainly no reference to the Design Guide. As there is no information about how this proposal makes a positive contribution then we would suggest that this in itself is a reason for refusal as the applicants do not appear to have complied with the policy.

2.2 What is proposed, however, is a fairly bland flat roofed extension which fails to take account of, what we assume is probably a Victorian or Edwardian building. As such it could easily be a flat roofed extension on a modern property. Whilst it is not listed it does have a certain style, particularly in terms of the steep high pitch and

narrow rectangular windows – which we assume are original - on the upper floors. The existing side elevation drawing demonstrates this style very well. Unfortunately, whilst it takes some references from the existing building, we feel that the proposed extension destroys that symmetry, with its flat roof and blank wall. It's the flat roof that just jars and doesn't fit in.

2.3 The proposed elevation drawings refer to an "Alternative Rear Elevation". This is not explained especially as if this is the alternative, then there does not appear to be a favoured elevation. Be that as it may, the western end of the flat roof has a short sloping pitch, but there is no explanation for this or any reason for its function. The rear elevation with its patio doors and bi-fold doors are out of keeping with the age and style of the property and again, we feel, could be anywhere rather than on an attractive property in the conservation area.

2.4 We cannot see that this proposal has achieved a high-quality design and so we object on the grounds of it being contrary to Policy SP 24. It does not make a positive contribution to the area and fails to refer to the ESBC's excellent Design Guide.

2.5 The proposal is accompanied by a Heritage Statement. According to the National Planning Policy Framework (para. 194) in submitting a Heritage Statement, applicants are required to describe the significance of any heritage assets including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset's importance. It is then for the Local Planning authority to assess the particular significance of the heritage asset that may be affected.

2.6 We are afraid that this Heritage Statement does not provide any information which describes the importance of any heritage asset, in this case the Conservation Area. All it does is state that the proposal lies within the Conservation Area. We know that!! Whilst we understand that the level of detail has to be proportionate, we feel that it has not complied with the NPPF because there is no detail at all.

2.7 The Statement then goes on to state that the proposal has been designed to create a large family space whilst being sympathetic to the local area and heritage. There is no explanation as to how this sympathy has been achieved or how the design actually respects the local heritage. Just saying this does not make it a reality. Due to the paucity of this Heritage Statement, we have to express our surprise that ESBC has accepted and registered the application, accordingly.

2.8 There is no reference to the relevant heritage planning policies and no reference to the Design Guide. We have argued above that we feel that the proposal does not make a positive contribution to the area. As a consequence, therefore, we do not feel that the proposal protects, preserves and enhances the conservation area and the character of the existing building..

2.9 A few years ago, English Heritage, as was, undertook a national survey of conservation areas and identified a number of issues that had eroded their quality. One of these was unsympathetic extensions. We feel that this proposal falls into that category and as a consequence, if permitted, will only further lead to a decline in the quality of the conservation area.

2.10 We object to the proposal as being contrary to Policies SP 25 and DP5 on the grounds of it not preserving, protecting and enhancing the conservation area and not respecting the building's context and appearance.

3. 00265 – The Middle Bell : Alterations to conservatory fire exit doors and cladding to walls/glazing, alterations to patio areas, reduce existing smoking shelter by 50%, wall cladding and new door to existing rear entrance

We question whether the Heritage Statement actually meets the requirements of the NPPF. It is meant to state the significance of any heritage asset and, in this case, this should be the Listed Building and the Conservation Area. All the Heritage Statement does is repeat the listed building description. It even states that it has researched the pub and the village, but it fails to mention the conservation area, the conservation area assessment and any historical information

about the role of the pub. The Design and Access Statement doesn't do much better. It states that the conservatory has no historical or architectural significance. That being the case, if they were concerned about the heritage of the property then we would have thought that they would provide a better, and more fitting conservatory, appropriate for the listed status of the pub.

The existing external arrangement consists of shallow planting and linked chained posts. Whilst this might not be the most attractive landscaping, at least it is sufficiently insignificant and low key so as to preserve the character and visual appeal of the listed building. What is proposed for both the side and rear elevations are much more substantial planters constructed of what looks like three-high railway sleepers with some sort of glass screen placed on top. This looks like an external patio solution to any pub rather than one for this village and a building of listed status. The overall effect, especially once planting has matured, will be that the appearance of the listed building and its fenestration will be largely obstructed. This to our minds affects the setting and integrity of the building. It is as though they already had a solution which was going to be imposed without sufficiently analysing what was appropriate for this specific building and its listed status.

We also question whether the painted weatherboard cladding is an appropriate material for this listed building. This material does not appear to have been used on the building before and it is certainly not included in the listed building description. So is there some justification for it or is it just a designer's affectation? The applicant's justification for the cladding in the Design and Access Statement is that it will complement the external landscaping. That may be so but we have already questioned whether the substantial planters are appropriate and, therefore, the use of cladding merely compounds the problem. This approach also seems to confirm our thought that a generic solution has been imposed.

Overall we do not feel that the applicants have taken sufficient account of the integrity of the listed building. Policy SP 25 states that development proposals must protect, preserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings taking into account their significance as well as their distinctive character. This should include high quality design as stipulated in the National Planning Policy Framework and ESBC's own Design Guide. We feel that because the design proposal could be anywhere, we do not feel that the applicants have demonstrated how a high quality design has been achieved or indeed how their proposal protects, conserves and enhances the listed building.

According to Policy DP 5 heritage assets are to be protected and enhanced and designs should make a positive contribution. In particular alterations to listed buildings should set out how the proposal would affect the significance of the asset - in this case the listed building. We think that harm will be done to the integrity and setting of the listed building and so we would have to disagree with the applicants when they state that their proposal would have no impact on the appearance or the historic fabric of the building.

The proposed increase in the outdoor seating area has a clear potential to increase the amount of noise made by patrons and audible in the surrounding area. This in itself changes the character of the conservation area. ESBC Planning and Licensing departments will be aware of previous complaints of noise and behaviour of patrons outside the building from occupiers of residential properties in the vicinity. If consent for this additional seating is granted we ask for an assurance that there will always be adequate staffing to monitor patrons in this outside area and control the impact of noise on neighbouring properties.

We object to the proposal as being contrary to Local Plan policies SP 25 and DP 5 in that the applicants have not demonstrated how their design protects, conserves and enhances the listed building. We would also like to suggest that the proposal is referred to a Design Panel as allowed for under Policy SP 24 so that we can ensure high quality design has been achieved.

4. 00266 - The Middle Bell : Listed Buildings Consent for the alterations to conservatory fire exit doors and cladding to walls/glazing, alterations to patio areas, reduce existing smoking shelter by 50%, wall cladding and new door to existing rear entrance

We question whether the Heritage Statement actually meets the requirements of the NPPF. It is meant to state the significance of any heritage asset and, in this case, this should be the Listed Building and the Conservation Area. All the Heritage Statement does is repeat the listed building description. It even states that it has researched the pub and the village, but it fails to mention the conservation area, the conservation area assessment and any historical information about the role of the pub. The Design and Access Statement doesn't do much better. It states that the conservatory has no historical or architectural significance. That being the case, if they were concerned about the heritage of the property then

we would have thought that they would provide a better, and more fitting conservatory, appropriate for the listed status of the pub.

The existing external arrangement consists of shallow planting and linked chained posts. Whilst this might not be the most attractive landscaping, at least it is sufficiently insignificant and low key so as to preserve the character and visual appeal of the listed building. What is proposed for both the side and rear elevations are much more substantial planters constructed of what looks like three-high railway sleepers with some sort of glass screen placed on top. This looks like an external patio solution to any pub rather than one for this village and a building of listed status. The overall effect, especially once planting has matured, will be that the appearance of the listed building and its fenestration will be largely obstructed. This to our minds affects the setting and integrity of the building. It is as though they already had a solution which was going to be imposed without sufficiently analysing what was appropriate for this specific building and its listed status.

We also question whether the painted weatherboard cladding is an appropriate material for this listed building. This material does not appear to have been used on the building before and it is certainly not included in the listed building description. So is there some justification for it or is it just a designer's affectation? The applicant's justification for the cladding in the Design and Access Statement is that it will complement the external landscaping. That may be so but we have already questioned whether the substantial planters are appropriate and, therefore, the use of cladding merely compounds the problem. This approach also seems to confirm our thought that a generic solution has been imposed.

Overall we do not feel that the applicants have taken sufficient account of the integrity of the listed building. Policy SP 25 states that development proposals must protect, preserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings taking into account their significance as well as their distinctive character. This should include high quality design as stipulated in the National Planning Policy Framework and ESBC's own Design Guide. We feel that because the design proposal could be anywhere, we do not feel that the applicants have demonstrated how a high quality design has been achieved or indeed how their proposal protects, conserves and enhances the listed building.

According to Policy DP 5 heritage assets are to be protected and enhanced and designs should make a positive contribution. In particular alterations to listed buildings should set out how the proposal would affect the significance of the asset - in this case the listed building. We think that harm will be done to the integrity and setting of the listed building and so we would have to disagree with the applicants when they state that their proposal would have no impact on the appearance or the historic fabric of the building.

The proposed increase in the outdoor seating area has a clear potential to increase the amount of noise made by patrons and audible in the surrounding area. This in itself changes the character of the conservation area. ESBC Planning and Licensing departments will be aware of previous complaints of noise and behaviour of patrons outside the building from occupiers of residential properties in the vicinity. If consent for this additional seating is granted we ask for an assurance that there will always be adequate staffing to monitor patrons in this outside area and control the impact of noise on neighbouring properties.

We object to the proposal as being contrary to Local Plan policies SP 25 and DP 5 in that the applicants have not demonstrated how their design protects, conserves and enhances the listed building. We would also like to suggest that the proposal is referred to a Design Panel as allowed for under Policy SP 24 so that we can ensure high quality design has been achieved.

5. 00390 – 90 Captains Lane : Conversion of garage to form additional living accommodation and single storey front extension
6. 00411 – Park Corner, 83 Main Street : Felling of one Conifer tree – *no objections*
7. 00412 – Moor End Cottage, 28 Station Road : Felling of Rowan tree (1), Cherry tree (2), Ash tree (3), Lilac tree (4) and pruning of 2 x Apple trees (5 and 6), Cherry tree (7), 2 x Conifer trees (8 and 9) – *no objections*
8. 00446 – 22 Barton Gate : Installation of a utility door to the ground floor and window to the first floor on the rear elevation and installation of rooflight on the side elevation roofslope
9. 00472 – 38 Barton Gate : Erection of a single storey rear extension, front canopy and render to entire property

ESBC Decisions – Permissions Granted

1. 00295 - The Vicarage , 3 Church Lane : Raise crown over adjacent footpath to provide 2.4m clearance to 1 Hawthorn tree (T1) and minor tip prune, reduce lateral growth towards adjacent footpath/drive and growth towards property by a maximum of 2m or to nearest suitable pruning point for clearance to one English Oak (T2)
2. 00281 - Eagle House , 74 Station Road : Thin lateral branches by 10%, crown thin by 10% and cut back lateral branches to give 2 metre clearance to the property one Cedar tree (T1 of TPO 44)
3. 00326 – 71 Arden Road : Erection of a single storey front extension and conversion of garage to form additional living accommodation
4. P/2021/00958 - Land off Westmead Road, Erection of two detached dwellings and the formation of an associated access, 74 Wales Lane : Erection of two detached dwellings and formation of associated access

Appeals

1. APP/B3410/W21/3285069 2 Bell Lane (P/2019/01494 refusal) – Appeal dismissed

ESBC Planning Policy Changes

Notification of Confirmed Article 4 Direction - restriction of permitted development rights from C3 (dwelling house) to C4 (Small House of Multiple Occupation) within the settlement boundary of Burton on Trent.

East Staffordshire Borough Council (ESBC) has now confirmed these new planning rules concerning small Houses of Multiple Occupation in the Burton on Trent area, giving one year's notice until the new rules come into effect. 1/4/23

VEC report 3rd May 2022

The trees in the Queens copse are growing well. ESBC have cut the grass around the trees but left the grass and wild flowers to grow between them.

Ed and Andy Simpson are coordinating to light the beacon on the church tower at 9.45 on Thursday 2nd June.

AJJ for VEC

CORRESPONDENCE

GENERAL

1. Wales Lane Resident request for speeding to be tackled in general – *Clerk responded*
2. Residents reports on fly-tipped furniture between Brookside Close and Fallowfield Drive – *reported and chasing ESBC for collection; PCSO Tim Leathers also notified of ASB and has attended.*
3. Further correspondence with resident of Scotch Hills Lane concerning traffic issues – *Clerk and Cllr Jessel responded*
4. John Taylor High School invitation to Annual Presentation Evening 12/7/22 6.30pm (2 representatives) and request for donation towards prizes

SCC/HIGHWAYS

8. Cllr Jessel: reports and communications

ESBC

9. Climate Change and Sustainable Development Consultation

POLICE

10. Report circulated.

SPCA/NALC/SLCC

11. SPCA – Newsletters, training circulars

Speedwatch 3rd May 2022

Just a couple of sessions this month- Efflinch Lane and The Green.

407 vehicles checked, of which 31 were reported as excessive speed. The fastest was doing 48 in a 30 zone with 5 others doing over 40 in 30 areas.

AJJ