

**Barton under Needwood Parish Council - Receipts and Payments Monthly Summary**

2023-24

Receipts	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Rents	900.00	387.50	450.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,737.50		
Interest	55.49	64.21	74.91	75.75	75.60	76.00	99.64	120.98	114.54	668.76	96.93	0.00	1,522.81		
ESBC	40,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	81,000.00		
LA Other	932.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	932.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,865.00		
Burial Ground	2,630.00	1,830.00	900.00	1,275.00	2,375.00	825.00	1,380.00	790.00	1,000.00	165.00	75.00	0.00	13,245.00	12,000	1,245
Fishpond	275.00	1,125.00	0.00	907.00	329.00	201.00	193.00	41.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	3,077.00	3,000	77
VAT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,424.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,424.89		
Car Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,107.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,107.94		
BVH Sal, Tax & NIC	979.88	936.90	1,118.91	1,099.99	1,092.65	1,084.86	941.70	1,224.25	1,152.50	800.29	1,317.19	0.00	11,749.12		
Other	0.00	0.00	57.90	35.00	40.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	132.91		
Grants/donations	50.00	1,463.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	6,000.00	0.00	0.00	479.17	0.00	8,043.16		
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>46,322.87</b>	<b>5,807.60</b>	<b>2,601.72</b>	<b>3,392.74</b>	<b>3,912.25</b>	<b>58,202.19</b>	<b>2,614.35</b>	<b>8,176.23</b>	<b>2,267.04</b>	<b>1,634.05</b>	<b>1,974.29</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>136,905.33</b>		

Payments	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Bank Charges	0.00	11.97	44.12	0.00	17.98	18.47	29.25	23.04	21.76	12.33	9.96	0.00	188.88		
Salaries	3,033.75	3,033.47	3,299.35	3,030.85	3,287.75	3,023.29	3,029.74	3,923.29	3,319.26	3,169.58	3,390.03		35,540.37		
HMRC	1,148.71	986.16	2,243.66	980.27	1,476.88	1,156.59	1,013.59	927.30	1,632.77	1,183.03	964.06		13,713.02		
Nest Pensions	172.11	344.22	0.00	172.44	172.42	173.70	173.26	172.49	436.09	0.00	178.84		1,995.57		
Admin	1,215.39	1,857.42	392.37	693.50	1,012.26	689.30	945.78	42.98	299.27	652.69	206.88		8,007.84		
Burial Ground	1,821.58	16.67	848.27	183.34	318.16	166.67	204.28	183.34	672.96	70.83	286.67		4,772.77	2,250.00	-2,522.77
Allotments	310.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	114.37	0.00	0.00	875.00	0.00	0.00	112.85	0.00	1,412.22	1,460.00	47.78
Fishpond	124.61	2,432.33	1,012.54	13,645.27	550.36	98.00	0.00	0.00	551.25	0.00	98.00	0.00	18,512.36	18,500.00	-12.36
Donations	0.00	25.00	0.00	570.00	0.00	0.00	63.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	658.00		
P&OS	145.60	2,159.46	3,260.66	5.33	2,235.66	0.00	17,868.19	44.64	320.00	91.98	80.00	0.00	26,211.52	33,500.00	7,288.48
Capital Exp	0.00	0.00	0.00	583.33	0.00	141.92	479.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,204.42		
Maintenance	125.65	397.70	24.07	29.57	663.00	0.00	85.40	361.26	0.00	580.00	1,061.59	0.00	3,328.24		
Car Park	83.36	83.36	965.63	83.36	759.20	83.36	83.36	104.20	83.36	83.36	104.20		2,516.75		
Lengthsmen	208.40	208.40	260.50	208.40	260.50	208.40	208.40	260.50	308.40	208.40	260.50		2,600.80		
General payments	0.00	146.01	6.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.69	12.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	169.01		
Projects	0.00	1,270.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,270.00		
BVH Contra	1,008.99	949.98	1,237.83	1,100.01	899.81	1,167.67	932.31	1,194.33	1,188.24	898.52	1,283.57		11,861.26		
VEC	189.96	603.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.90	92.50	0.00	158.33	0.00	1,071.68	1,590.00	518.32
VAT	168.67	964.12	1,065.58	2,888.30	946.13	107.60	3,720.41	292.83	280.08	58.71	297.37		10,789.80		
<b>Total Spend</b>	<b>9,756.78</b>	<b>15,490.26</b>	<b>14,660.85</b>	<b>24,173.97</b>	<b>12,714.49</b>	<b>7,034.97</b>	<b>28,836.14</b>	<b>8,436.79</b>	<b>9,217.98</b>	<b>7,009.43</b>	<b>8,492.84</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>145,824.51</b>		

**Scheduled Payments presented to Full Council**

07/03/2024

<b>Payee</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>£ Value Gross</b>	<b>£ VAT</b>	<b>£ NET</b>
Salaries total		4,056.70		4,056.70 HR
Nest Pension Scheme		189.33		189.33 HR
HMRC		1,172.70		1,172.70 HR
Mitmark	CCTV	96.00	16.00	80.00 P&OS
Barton Fire Brigade Social Club	Donation - help with star	50.00		50.00 Donations
Holland Sports Club	Meeting room hire 23/2/24	50.00		50.00 Admin
Kim Bedford	Council Strategy Forming	447.00		447.00 Admin
Barton Fields	Topsoil for Burial Ground	75.00	12.50	62.50 B. Ground
				<b>6,108.23</b>

---

Notifications:

**Vision ICT team**

RE: Email Price Increase Effective April 1st, 2024

Beginning April 1st, 2024, you will notice a modest increase in the pricing of our email services, the new price is £20 + VAT (instead of £18 + VAT).

Scheduled Payments

Authorised Chairman .....

<b>Barton under Needwood Parish Council</b>		<b>Bank Reconciliation as per statements at:</b>			29-Feb-24
Lloyds Current A/C			£	2,001.00	
Lloyds Deposit (Instant Access) A/C			£	79,902.80	
National Savings			£	74,494.67	
Petty Cash			£	150.00	
<b>Total Bank Balances</b>					<b>£ 156,548.47</b>
<b>Add Credits not on Statement</b>					
				£0.00	<b>£ 156,548.47</b>
<b>Less unrepresented payments:-</b>					
		3488		50.00	
				£50.00	<b>£ 156,498.47</b>
<b>Opening Balances :-</b>		<b>Bank Statements as at 31st March 2023</b>			
Lloyds Current A/C		£	2,001.00		
Lloyds Deposit A/C		£	87,522.39		
National Savings		£	73,922.73		
Petty Cash		£	150.00		
Parish Council -		<b>Total</b>	<b>£ 163,596.12</b>		
<b>Add Receipts to date</b>					
		£	136,945.33		
<b>Less Expenditure to date</b>					
		£	144,042.98		
Total Cash and Investments as at -				<b>£ 156,498.47</b>	
				<b>Difference</b>	-£ 0.00
RFO, S. Rumsby					

### **Parking Outside 6 to 8 Main Street**

A Parishioner recently approached me regarding the on-street parking between 6 and 8 Main Street (outside the former Liquor n Allsorts). They expressed concerns regarding the appropriateness of the parking restrictions, these being a 30 minute limit **Monday to Saturday from 8am to 6pm** with no return within 30 minutes.

#### **Issues**

The restrictions may hail from the era of Liquor n Allsorts being a business there and thus may have been created with that in mind (i.e. hence 30 minute limit between 8am and 6pm). This would be to ensure people could park when coming and going to that business easily. However, as there's no longer a business there, that argument no longer remains.

Based on both what the Parishioner said and also data I found online from a few years ago, it seems that Clear Streets spend their limited time in the village giving out tickets in that location. I understand that they are enforcing extant rules, but whether residents would view this location as a priority is perhaps debatable.

It is not obvious that there are any particular road safety risks associated with parking there (as supported by it being allowed overnight, on Sundays and for up to 30 minutes during the restricted hours), although that would be for County/Highways to consider.

Whilst there may be a counter argument about parking there during school drop off/pick up times, I would note that someone could already do that from 3.30pm-4pm each day and be within the rules.

#### **Possible Solutions**

The view of the Parishioner would be for County/Highways to remove restrictions there or alternatively let residents have permits.

#### **Proposed Parish Council Motion:**

**To consider asking County/Highways to review the appropriateness of parking restrictions between 6 and 8 Main Street, in light of the former Liquor n Allsorts change of use to residential.**

**Cllr J Brookes 27/2/24**

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. 01306 - 34 Efflinch Lane : Erection of a single storey side extension & first floor side extension including window in existing garage door opening

*This property is within flood zone 3 and during flooding is subject to overland flow from Barton Brook to the rear towards Efflinch Lane at the front.*

*From the plans provided the gap between 34 Efflinch Lane and the adjacent 32, appears to be 2110mm. The proposed extension is shown as 1310mm with the gap for the flow route reduced to 800mm.*

*The extension permitted by P/2023/00475 did not significantly obstruct this flow route. The current proposal for the utility extension significantly does reduce the flow path width. This therefore increases the risk and seriousness of flooding to this property and adjacent properties and with it the danger to life.*

*We therefore object to this application.*

*With regard to the design, aesthetically the house appears to date from the interwar years. We felt that the original proposal in P/2023/00475 was designed for the front elevation to be in keeping with the existing building. The plain brick front elevation of the proposed utility room would be visible from Efflinch Lane and has no similarity to the appearance of the front but is in contrast and somewhat stark and intrusive and not in keeping with the provisions of SP24*

2. 00002 - Midlands Co-operative Society : installation of Photovoltaic panels to the roof of existing Co-op Foodstore  
*The proposal is to locate solar panels in two areas, more or less the whole of the pitched roof fronting Crowberry Lane and on what is the flat roof part of the main Co-op building. The building is situated in the heart of the commercial area of Main Street within the village and also in the conservation area.*

#### **Parish Council Comments**

*The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement. In accordance with the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework, this is intended to describe the significance of any heritage asset including any contribution made by their setting. This Statement merely describes the design and materials of the building and tells us that it is located within the conservation area, (although we note with an incorrect address – 6 Peel Street !!). As far as we are concerned the Statement fails to describe the significance of the context of the conservation area or indeed nearby listed buildings. What it does, very valuably, highlight, however, is that, “the building occupies a prominent position on a main street location.....”.*

*We understand that through Policy SP 28 the Borough Council wants to encourage and promote renewable and low carbon technologies. The Parish Council is also generally very supportive of sustainable energy, but with the caveat that they need to be considered within their particular context – in this case, this means the conservation area. As with an earlier planning application for the Co-op signs (P/2023/ 01358), we are afraid that the applicants have not taken sufficient account of this heritage context. Once again this is unfortunate especially as the Co-op had originally paid particular attention to the detail, scale and materials in designing a building that fitted within the street scene and the village character. There is precious little evidence in this Heritage Statement that they have considered similar attention to detail or its heritage context.*

*In terms of the impact of these solar panels, the Heritage Statement merely states that, the majority of the panels being on the roof will be hidden from view. For the panels on the flat roof part of the main building this may be true, but, for the panels on the pitched roof of the Crowberry Lane frontage, this is certainly not the case as they will be very visible.*

*This aspect of visibility is important because in making comments on this proposal we have taken our lead from the Case Officer’s report (P/2022/00904) for an application for solar panels on the roof of Gresham House, Dunstall Road. In approving this application, the Case Officer noted that the panels were located on roof slopes that are extremely well screened from the public highway. Screening also took the form of large hedgerows and trees. The Case Officer, therefore, came to the view that the proposal was considered to have little impact on the conservation area. Now, we are aware that you have to treat each application on their merits, but it seems to us that the criteria for assessing solar panels from this case officer’s report is pretty clear and can equally apply to all such applications, ie. visibility is important to any impact that they may have on the conservation area.*

*Assuming that we can apply this visibility criterion to this application then clearly the panels on the Crowberry Lane roof are very visible not just from Crowberry Lane but also from an eastern and southerly direction on Main Street, especially from the*

*Middle Bell which is a listed building. The applicants have already admitted that the Co-op building is in a prominent position within Main Street. We submit that these particular panels would be visibly detrimental to the amenity of the conservation area and, therefore, contrary to Policies SP 25 and DP 5. Our fear is that if this proposal is approved, then it could act as a precedent for the other properties in the conservation area - particularly south facing properties - to follow suit.*

*In view of the impact on the conservation area of this proposal, on a very prominent building, we also feel that it fails to meet the criteria of high quality design required by Policy SP 24 as it does – as a consequence – not make a positive contribution to the area.*

*In conclusion, we have no objection to the solar panels on the main roof but with the inclusion of the panels on the Crowberry Lane elevation in clear view within the conservation area we object to the application in its current form as being subject to Policies SP 25, DP 5 and SP 24.*

3. 00101 - 42 Captains Lane : Erection of a part single storey part two storey rear extension with Juliet balcony, first floor front extension, front canopy & alterations to include render, timber cladding & replacement windows and door – *no objections*
4. 00125 - 74 Captains Lane : Erection of a single storey side and part two storey and single storey rear extension and front canopy  
*We are concerned that although only ground floor, the extension to the west, being on the boundary with the adjacent house, no. 76, the east wall of which is itself on or close to the boundary, would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on no. 76. We are also concerned about access to the walls of both properties for future maintenance*
5. 00088 - 44 Main Street : Demolition of existing extension and outbuildings to facilitate the erection of a single storey extension to the North West elevation  
*We are disappointed that the large windows to the NW facing elevation are so large, being more akin to an orangery than the original cottage style windows of the original traditional building within this conservation area.*  
*The NW facing elevation appears to show on the adjacent premises a window above the southern end of the current, due to be demolished, building. The roof of the proposed replacement appears to be higher than the original roof and so to partially obscure this window.*  
*The relative heights of this window and the proposed roof are not clear from the plans but potentially could result in a material loss of light to this window of the adjacent dwelling contrary to DP3.*  
*In view of this lack of clarity we object to the application in its current form.*
6. 00171 - 29 Causer Road : Part change of use of double garage and erection of a storm porch – *no objections*
7. P/2023/00814 - Land at Dunstall Road/Small Meadows Lane, Barton  
*We have recently become aware of significant changes to the design of the proposed construction on this site together.*  
*We are disappointed that no formal notification of these changes was conveyed to consultees including ourselves or neighbouring properties. We obviously wish to examine these changes in order to consider making any additional comments on the revised scheme.*  
*We still have concerns over the proposed treatment of both foul and surface water. Indications are that the groundwater level on the site is too close to the surface for infiltration and soakaway to be feasible. In these circumstances infiltration testing to BRE365 is recommended and we see no evidence of results from such testing.*  
*The date by which comments can be received we see is now 8th March which does not afford consultees and objectors the necessary opportunity to consider the implications of the changes and any further comments thus generated before the matter is decided."*  
*We maintain our original objection to this proposal and request an extension to the consultation period so that we and other consultees have the opportunity to make further representations.*

## ESBC Decisions – Permissions Granted

8. 01158 - Silverhill Court, Barton Gate : Conversion and extensions to existing outbuilding to form an annexe including demolition of existing buildings
9. 01359 - 34 Captains Lane : Erection of a single storey rear extension and alterations to front elevation (re-submission of approved P/2022/000920)
10. 01384 - Land off Westmead Road : Application under section 73 to vary condition 2 attached to the planning permission P/2021/00958 for the erection of two detached dwellings and formation of associated access alterations to include solar panels on plot 2 to the front and rear elevations and deeper porch
11. 01402 - Victoria Cottage, Dunstall Road : Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear/side extension
12. 2024/00014 - Victoria Cottage, Dunstall Road : Listed Building Consent for the demolition of conservatory, erection of a single storey rear/side extension
13. 01270 - 22 Meadow Rise : Erection of a two storey front, side and rear extension and single storey rear extension, new pitched roof to front of property and driveway amendments

## Correspondence

**To Naomi Campbell, cc. ESBC Ward Cllrs**

**Response to Parish Council's Planning Matters**

*Thank you, Naomi, for your undated response to our expressed concerns from over the last year or so both regarding a number of specific planning applications and our ongoing debate about conservation areas.*

*We very much appreciate the time and trouble that you personally have taken to respond, and we would certainly welcome the opportunity to talk to you face to face.*

*Can we perhaps, firstly, comment on some of the general issues you raised in your letter and then, secondly, proceed to respond to the specific issues regarding the planning applications. We would then like to focus the attention of any meeting with you on the heritage and conservation issues and one more issue which has recently been brought to the fore. This is the issue about how to maintain and hopefully promote the role of Barton as both a Rural Centre and a Strategic Village.*

**Response to the issues raised in your letter**

*We are very much aware of the pressures on Local Planning Authorities due primarily to successive years of Government funding cutbacks for local government. We do appreciate your funding and staffing difficulties, not least your access to limited resources for heritage issues. Against that background, we would like to think that, when commenting on planning applications, we provide a considered response in accordance with the relevant local plan policies. We have not been aware, for example, that we have been asking for things that are unachievable. We have sometimes suggested that a design could perhaps be improved, but we accept that it will be up to the case officer to decide, if this is something they can take forward with the applicant, as we are sure that they will always want to achieve the best outcome for the area. True, we have recently been concerned about the loss of trees in the conservation area. In those instances, recognising the limitations of the legislation, we have normally suggested that a replacement tree might be an idea that could be put to the applicant. Our experience with owners of properties and listed buildings is that they generally realise they are custodians and would like to ensure that the environment is protected for future generations.*

*You mention that you felt that our comments could be more focused so that case officers can understand our concerns. We are not quite sure what you mean by these comments, but perhaps this is something we can discuss more fully at any meeting. If case officers do not understand our concerns, then we are more than happy to explain at the end of a phone, but, as far as we are aware, nobody has ever contacted us. We have always taken the view that if we say that we feel a particular proposal does not meet a specific policy then we need to justify this and explain our reasoning, and this is what we try and put across in our submissions. We hope that this approach is helpful to case officers. We always try to directly relate the proposal to the detailed criteria set out in the Local Plan policy, and so we are a little surprised that you feel our comments are not focused. We do not feel that just making a series of bullet points, for example, helps you understand our reasoning.*

*Our submissions do tend to place the proposals into context, but this is because we are also writing for a local audience who may not be familiar with the planning policy criteria – you will be aware that our submissions are reported and appear on the full Parish Council agenda and website. We do not generally reiterate the full planning policy, as you suggest, but we do summarise the policy and highlight the relevant criteria, relating to the particular proposal, for the benefit of our local audience so that they may understand the points we are making and why. We went into some detail, precisely for this for reason, for example, with recent, locally controversial applications for housing at the allotments on St James Road, and at Small Meadows Lane.*

*If we are guilty of anything, it is perhaps taking the planning policies at face value. Can we give you just a few examples? :-*

*When a Policy SP 24 incorporates a facility to refer an application to a Design Review Panel, we had always assumed that this applied to all planning applications. Neither the policy nor the accompanying text refers to any conditions. Your letter informed us, for the first time might we say, that this facility is only used for perhaps larger scale proposals, as you have to make a decision about proportionality. We did not know that this was the interpretation you were placing on this facility. How could we, when we have not been informed until now? You will be aware, that on several occasions, particularly for proposals in the conservation area we have requested that an application be referred. What has frustrated us is that invariably this request is ignored in the case officers' reports. It is not even picked up in the summary of our comments, so we have had no understanding as to why requesting a referral was inappropriate. In one or two instances the response in the case officer's report has been that it was not considered appropriate – OK fine, but again this doesn't really tell us why. Could not the officer response have explained rather than just ignoring our request?*

*When Policy SP 24 also states that developers will be required to demonstrate how they have responded to the criteria in their applications, we had assumed that by using the term "required" this was an imperative. In practice, very few applicants actually do this. For consultees, this can be very helpful in trying to understand how a proposal makes a positive contribution to its location. It is important for us to understand what the applicant is trying to achieve, and it can also provide a greater insight in, for example, where a contemporary rather than a more traditional style is proposed. If this is not a requirement, then why is it included within the policy, if it is virtually ignored by applicants?*

*Policy DP 5 states that applications for listed buildings will be considered if they are accompanied by a Statement of Significance. This phrasing implies, at least to us, that if a such a Statement has not been prepared then the application will not be considered. We had, perhaps naively, assumed that this means that it would not be registered until such time as the appropriate document had been submitted. Is this the case? We can only reiterate that such Statements can provide consultees with a greater understanding of what the applicant is trying to achieve. We have considered several applications recently where what the applicants have called a Heritage Statement has been submitted but it certainly does not address issues in the policy. You have expressed sympathy with our predicament, but you seem to be saying that you can do nothing about the quality of any response. Again, if this is a directive within an adopted Local Plan policy, are there no sanctions that you can apply?*

*May we also refer to a similar issue which we raised albeit a few years ago? Policy SP 32 states that open space should not be built on unless an assessment has been made demonstrating that the space was surplus to requirements and where spaces are lost then a replacement must be made available prior to its loss. There are no conditions attached either in the policy or the accompanying text, so we assumed that these requirements applied to all open spaces, however small, as there were no de minimis caveats. The applicants provided no assessment and there was no offer of replacement space. The case officer's report looked at visual amenity, and its role as a pedestrian path, but did not address the issue of whether it was surplus to requirements, at least not to the full extent as set out in the SPD. The issue of replacement space was also not addressed. And yet you approved a planning application to extend a private garden and subsequently gave permission for residential use.*

*We hope that these brief examples provide the background for why we have been concerned about the interpretation of planning policy within the village. We have also felt that case officer reports do not always explain or justify their reasoning as to why proposals are in line with the relevant policies or address the criteria in any great detail. Policy SP24, for example, states that proposals must make a positive contribution to the area. Reports often use the phrase that, 'it fits in well with its surroundings', but without explaining how. And this often occurs when we have strongly objected. Whilst we appreciate that views on design are subjective, when you have a policy criterion that states that all proposals must make a positive contribution is there not, therefore, an obligation for the case officer to explain how, especially if high quality design is to be achieved? This is important because high quality design can set a precedent and act as a benchmark for future development.*



**Responses to your comments on the specific planning applications**

Perhaps we could just briefly respond to the comments you made about the specific applications? :-

*Grafton Cottage – We are still somewhat confused by your comments. With this proposal we could not understand why an extension to the west could be acceptable but one at the rear was not. Surely, a sideward extension of a built-up frontage outside a settlement boundary could become a precedent, in any other similar locations? We understand that you rejected the rearward extension on the grounds of potential precedent, but the rearward extension for 61 The Green has become an actual precedent and this you found acceptable. We think the problem comes down to how do you square precedence, or indeed the potential for precedence, with the principal of treating each application on their merits?*

*272 Efflinch Lane – We were concerned to protect the front elevation of this property from what we felt was a modern front porch not in keeping with the style of the villa and a neither here- nor-there side extension. At the time, we felt that the best way of achieving this objective was to consider whether it could be listed. In our submission we asked if you would consider it was worth listing and asked for an explanation if not. The case officer's report completely ignored this request and made no reference to it either in their summary of our comments or in the report itself (as well incidentally of ignoring a request for Design Review) so we had no way of knowing what was happening. When we made an explicit request such as with this application, why was it ignored and why was it not be addressed in the report?*

*Trent Valley/Newbold Quarry extension – Thank you for referring us to the Annual Monitoring Report for Policy DP 10. At the time of the submission of this proposal for the extension of Newbold Quarry we had already read the latest AMR on this issue. The issue we were interested in - and we apologise if it wasn't clear – was not about the performance of the policy but was in relation to the accompanying para 4.18. This paragraph refers to a joined-up approach to the Trent Valley, in order to balance the competing objectives for restored sites. We just felt that, if progress had been made on this partnership working, then it might have something to say about the then current proposal to extend Newbold Quarry northwards. It was really a simple request for an update and to see if any Partnership work had resulted in anything that would be relevant to this proposal accordingly.*

*Co-op Signs – the issue about the signs was that we did not feel that the case officer had taken sufficient account of the Shopfronts Design Guide SPD 2019. This identified that colour and finishes should be related both to the building and the prevailing character of the area. In particular, bright primary colours were to be avoided, where these would be unduly prominent in the street scene, and similarly high gloss finishes were to be avoided. The signs consisted of lime green on a white background with a high gloss finish. We know that lime green is not a primary colour, but we could not understand how this colour reflected a heritage palette and how high gloss can be allowed seemingly contrary to the SPD.*

*We would like to take up your offer of a face-to-face meeting. At that meeting could we briefly discuss these outstanding planning application issues? But we feel it would be beneficial if the meeting could concentrate on two concerns Conservation Areas and the role of Rural Centres.*

**Rural Centres and Strategic Villages**

*Our concern about Rural Centres stems from the recent approval of residential development on the former Country Services site, off Bell Lane. We reckon that this is about the fourth commercial premises on Main Street we have lost in recent years. We appreciate that the village, relatively speaking, still has a reasonable level of services and facilities but it is the loss of retail and commercial opportunities that we are most concerned about. We feel that we are perhaps getting to the point where the objectives of both Strategic Villages and, particularly, Rural Centres for maintaining a basic level of commercial services and facilities are not being met. If the aim of the Local Plan policy is to protect these facilities, then how is that to be achieved, when permission is given for residential use? The issue is one of sustainability both in terms of providing a viable rural centre which can service a wider rural catchment and trying to minimise the use of the car. If facilities are lost, then the use of the private car increases as people travel to larger centres.*

**Conservation Areas**

*Our outstanding issues really relate to our original letter. We would like to discuss these issues with you and perhaps we could illustrate our concerns with the specific examples in that letter. Generally speaking, these issues include the following :-*

*Plastic vs wooden windows and doors;*

*Demolition in Conservation Areas;*

*Co-op and Middle Bell signs;*

*Extensions especially 7 and 10 Main Street;*

*Proposals being seen from the public realm vs the integrity of the listed building and the Conservation Area;*

*The role of Article 4 directions in Conservation Areas;*

*Need for more information for developers and property owners about heritage issues and Local Plan policy requirements;*

*Updating Appraisals and producing Management Plans - Is there a role for Parish Councils;*

*Working together, how can we ensure that the conservation area is enhanced and preserved?*

*We hope that this response helps you better understand our concerns. We thank you once again for your time in considering them. We will look forward to arranging a face to face meeting in the near future.*

<b>Barton under Needwood Parish Council</b>				
<b>Burial Ground Charges</b>	01/04/2022			<b>01/04/2024</b>
		6% Increase		Rounded
<b><u>Purchase of an 'Exclusive Right of Burial'</u></b>				
Single Width Grave	750	6.00%	795	<b>795</b>
Double Width Grave	750	6.00%	795	<b>795</b>
Cremated Remains Space	350	6.00%	371	<b>370</b>
<b><i>Plus</i></b>				
For each interment or re-opening of an existing grave:				
Adult	550	6.00%	583	<b>585</b>
For interment of Cremated Remains	175	6.00%	185.5	<b>185</b>
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.				
	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b><u>Memorial Wall and Scattering of Cremated Remains</u></b>				
Scattering of Cremated Remains in Memorial Garden and single sized plaque on Memorial Wall	375	6.00%	397.5	<b>400</b>
Scattering of Cremated Remains in Memorial Garden 1 + 1 reserved and double sized plaque on Memorial Wall (4 lines of inscription per scattering)	450	6.00%	477	<b>480</b>
Additional Inscription on Double sized plaque (further 4 lines of inscription)	165	6.00%	174.9	<b>200 Amended</b>
<b><u>For the erection of Memorials etc</u></b>				
Headstone	275	6.00%	291.5	<b>300</b>
Tablet (Cremated Remains)	275	6.00%	291.5	<b>300</b>
Additional Inscription	80	6.00%	84.8	<b>85</b>
<u>S. Rumsby - Clerk to the Council</u>				
07/03/2024				

A Meeting of **Barton-under-Needwood Parish Council Communications Committee** was held on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2024 at 1pm, Barton Village Hall, Crowberry Lane, Barton under Needwood.



**Attendees:** Councillors Sally Bedford (Chair of Committee), Ed Sharkey, James Brookes, Charley Walker and Siobhan Rumsby (Parish Clerk) who attended for part of the meeting

**Apologies:** Councillor Kevin McInerney

## 1. Apologies

Kevin McInerney

## 2. Appointment of Chair

2.1. Councillor Bedford was ratified at the Parish Council meeting held on the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2024 as the Chair of the Communications Committee.

## 3. Terms of Reference

3.1. An amended version of the terms of reference was discussed at the meeting. The following changes were agreed and will be circulated with the minutes. It was agreed the revised terms of reference would be shared with the VEC Chair. Councillor Sharkey asked for the terms of reference to be shared at the next Parish Council meeting.

3.2. The main proposed changes included;

- Use of the term Chairman to be changed to Chair.
- External members may be co-opted as appropriate.

## 4. Online Consultation and Parish Meeting

4.1 **Consultation with parishioners.** Councillor Sharkey set out a list of areas that he thought should be included in the Consultation which Councillors added to and included;

- Environment – Flooding at Barton Brook, Fullbrook, sewers, surface water flooding, access to green spaces and play, housing availability, for sale and rent and commercial development.
- Village Services – GP and health, Pharmacy, Post Office, Shops, Pubs and Schools.
- Roads and Public Rights of Way - Potholes, drain clearing, general road conditions and maintenance, footpaths and bridleways and the need for electric vehicle charging points.
- Country Park on the Newbold Quarry site.
- Burial Ground provision.
- Policing - PCSO presence, anti-social behaviours issues and other crime.
- Planning – ESBC planning liaison and ESBC decisions, ESBC Local Plan review, Housing Needs Survey & Conservation Area.
- Country Park on the Newbold Quarry site.
- Burial Ground provision.

Councillor Brookes also suggested the topic area of Transport.

Councillors Sharkey and Bedford agreed to meet to draft the survey,

*Post script: a copy of the draft consultation has been shared with Committee Members for comment.*

The feedback from the survey would be presented at the Parish Meeting.

For those who are unable to access an online survey arrangements will be put in place for hard copies to be made available and support available for those who would struggle to complete the survey.

**4.2 Parish Meeting.** A date for the Parish Meeting is being finalised. Councillor Bedford offered to support the Clerk with securing a venue. It was agreed the Parish Clerk would draft a flyer for the event to be circulated to Parishioners by Royal Mail. A list of groups to be invited to Barton Live had been shared although some of the contacts were out of date.

## 5. **Notice Boards and planning**

It was agreed a review of notice boards should be carried out in terms of where sited, their condition and whether the information was out of date. Councillor Sharkey suggested we should try to recruit a volunteer to do this and to check all notice boards at regular intervals.

## 6. **Actions from the previous meeting**

**6.1 Website Audit.** The Parish Clerk was invited to attend. Councillor Brookes presented the website audit he had completed. A discussion took place about the audit and it was agreed Councillor Brookes would identify those more significant items which needed to be reported to the Parish Council and those minor issues required to correct out of date information, typos and formatting. The Parish Clerk reported she had already made a start on the latter and she would contact Vision ICT to ask for support to change the structure of the website.

## 7. **Any other business**

7.1 It was proposed by Councillor Sharkey that a suite of standard document templates should be developed for meeting agendas, minutes and report front covers. This would also include whether the papers were for information, approval or ratification. Actions with action owners and timescales should be clear. Councillor Bedford is going to develop the templates with the Parish Clerk.

8. **Next meeting** The next meeting will be held on Monday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2024 at 1-2.30pm in the Small Meeting Room, Village Hall.

## Barton under Needwood Parish Council



Clerk to the Council:  
Siobhan Rumsby  
Parish Council Office  
Village Hall  
Crowberry Lane  
Barton-under-Needwood  
Burton upon Trent  
DE13 8AF  
01283 716059

[clerk@bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk)  
[www.bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk](http://www.bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk)

## Communications Committee Terms of Reference February 2024

### Introduction

This Terms of Reference sets out the purpose of the Communications Committee and how it will operate.

### Purpose of Committee

The purpose of the Committee is to ensure effective communication and engagement. Its aims are:

- To create a two-way communication flow with parishioners and other stakeholders, using a variety of mediums in consultation with the Parish Clerk.
- To engage parishioners and stakeholders to encourage their participation in decision making and create an active and informed community.
- To ensure communications are effective and proportionate to their purpose.

### Terms of Reference

Specific responsibilities of the Committee will be:

- To review the accuracy and effectiveness of internal and external communications and provide recommendations (e.g. the Website, Social Media, Noticeboards and Chime communications).
- To be responsible for the development and maintenance of the Social Media Policy and an annual communications action plan to support the Parish Council strategy.
- To make recommendations regarding the appropriate level of communication and community engagement for Parish Council actions and decisions.
- To devise and implement community consultation methods (e.g. events/focus groups/surveys etc) as appropriate, to ascertain views and feed back into the Parish Council's strategic vision.
- To ensure any formal consultations are fit for purpose.

## Delegated Authority

To make decisions on behalf of the Parish Council in relation to the Terms of Reference set out above, subject to where appropriate:

- Financial implications (in consultation with Finance Committee and/or Parish Council).
- Strong links with all Committees and in particular the Village Enhancement Committee to ensure a coordinated approach for communications from/with the Parish Council.
- Parish Council consultation where matters are considered significant enough.
- If there is an appropriate Committee or subject matter expert they would normally draft communications first, before the communication then coming to the Communications Committee.

**MEETINGS:** Schedule meetings, as necessary.

**MEMBERSHIP:** To be drawn from members of the Council.

**QUORUM:** Three members.

**CHAIR:** The Chair of the Committee shall be elected after the Annual General Meeting in each new financial year by a simple majority.

**EXTERNAL ATTENDEES:** External members may be co-opted as required.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Meetings will be open to the public.

**WORKING PARTIES:** May be set up for specific time-limited tasks as required.

A Meeting of **Barton-under-Needwood Parish Council Communications Committee** was held on Monday 4th March 2024 at 1pm, Barton Village Hall, Crowberry Lane, Barton under Needwood.



**Attendees:** Councillors Sally Bedford (Chair of Committee), Ed Sharkey, James Brookes, Charley Walker and Siobhan Rumsby (Parish Clerk)

**Apologies:** Councillor Kevin McInerney

## 1. Apologies

Kevin McInerney

2. **Minutes** of the meeting held on the 12<sup>th</sup> February were agreed.

## 3. Actions from the previous meeting.

### 3.1 Website audit and proposed structure.

Councillor Brookes shared the work on the website audit and the structure proposed.

Councillor Bedford thanked him for doing the work and it was agreed it would be shared at the next Parish Council meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> March.

It was agreed that once the Parish Council had discussed the suggested revised structure, Councillor Bedford would contact each Committee Chair and ask them to review the relevant content on the website for their Committee with their members to check whether it needed updating or expanding.

### 3.2 Noticeboards

The Parish Clerk confirmed she checks the noticeboards at least monthly and in some cases fortnightly. Councillor Sharkey asked that notices should be replaced if they had suffered weather damage and that review/expiry dates should be included where possible. The Parish Clerk agreed and explained that items provided by other agencies tended to deteriorate if they were posted for a long time, but replacements were not often provided.

### 3.3 Meeting templates and minutes

It was agreed that a standard set of templates would be developed by the Parish Clerk for Parish Council meetings and Committee meetings to include agendas, minutes and front covers for significant items where further context was required. These would be shared with the Parish Council for approval at the April Parish Council meeting with the intention of using them in the new financial year.

It was also agreed to move to consecutive minute numbering for full Council minutes from 1 April and pick up an Action Plan document so that action points and who is responsible do not get missed or forgotten about.

## 4. Terms of Reference

4.1. An amended version of the terms of reference was discussed at the meeting. The following changes were agreed and will be circulated with the minutes.

4.2. The main proposed changes included;

4.2.1 Terms of reference, the second bullet was amended to include 'an annual communications action plan to support the Parish Council strategy for the following year'.

4.2.2 Delegated authority. The second bullet was amended to read 'Strong links with all Committees and in particular the Village Enhancement Committee'.

4.2.3 Delegated Authority to include if there is an appropriate Committee or subject matter expert they would normally draft communications first, before the communication then coming to the Communications Committee.



## 5. Online Consultation and output from the Strategy meeting

5.1 The Parish Council Strategy meeting had been held on 23<sup>rd</sup> February. Kim Bedford led the session and will be producing the report from it. She will not be writing the Strategy. There had been some useful discussion but Members felt it was a little rushed at the end. It was the first time the Parish Council had taken part in this type of event. Councillor Sharkey felt it didn't get into the longer term/medium term strategy. Ideas for engaging better with young people need to be developed. There would be an opportunity for Councillors to discuss this at the next meeting of the Parish Council.

5.2 Feedback on the online consultation document was discussed. Councillor Bedford will redraft the survey and share with the Communications Committee initially before sharing with all Councillors. The following items would be included as well some tidying up of the survey;

- Age demographic
- The Burial Ground
- General free text at the end.
- The range 1-5 to include strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree
- A question on whether individuals are likely to be flooded would be included.

5.3 Councillor Sharkey to liaise with the previous PC Chair about the last survey and the tools used.

## 6. Communication required for the Annual Parish Meeting

6.1 The Parish Clerk shared the flyer she had developed for the Annual Parish Meeting being held on 8<sup>th</sup> May at Holland Sports Club. It was agreed the Parish Office telephone number would be included for parishioners to register their interest. Flyers would be posted round the village and the Facebook page would also be used to advertise the meeting, Members have offered to support the Village Enhancement Committee to contact organisations and groups for Barton Live. The Parish Clerk to circulate a revised version to all Councillors for comment.

## 7. Feedback from the NALC Social Media Training

7.1 Members had attended the NALC online Social Media training. Feedback was mixed. Some good examples shared, some of the things weren't relevant for our village. In the short term carry on with our Facebook postings and aim to show case more of the work that the PC is doing.

## 8. Any other business

8.1 *PCSO Surgery*. The proposal by Councillor Walker for liaison with PCSO Edwards for a local surgery was supported and to be discussed further under 'Police Matters' with Full Council.

8.2 *Sharing of Parish Councillors' mobile numbers and home addresses*. Councillors Brookes and Walker had researched what was happening elsewhere and the legal requirements. After a full discussion it was agreed that we propose that the web-site should include Councillors' Parish Council email addresses and the Parish Council office telephone number. The Clerk asked about whether she could give out Councillors' personal phone numbers, and that she'd need clarity in order to be able to do so/not do so. Councillor Sharkey agreed to raise this with Parish Councillors. The register of interests forms do include Councillors' home addresses and their signatures. Many other Councils redact the signatures, but the addresses can only be redacted with a request to the Monitoring Officer for each Councillor.

8.3 *Policy Group*. Councillor Bedford thanked the Parish Clerk for setting up the dropbox with model policies and guidance developed by NALC and SLCC. She shared the template of policies recommended by SLCC for small Parish Councils. The HR Committee would be asked to consider adoption of these policies with a planned timescale for their development.

Previously it was agreed by the Parish Council that outdated policies would remain in force until the revised version was in place.

9. **Next meeting** The next meeting will be held on Friday 22nd March 2024 at 11.30am in the Small Meeting Room, Village Hall. It will be a single item on the online consultation.



# BARTON PARISH COUNCIL

8 MAY 2024, 6pm - 8pm  
HOLLAND SPORTS CLUB

**BARTON LIVE**

**MEET YOUR LOCAL  
COMMUNITY GROUPS**

**&**

**ANNUAL OPEN MEETING**

Potter's Yard Cafe at 7.00pm

**Your voice matters.  
A vital platform for  
community  
engagement, allowing  
us to collectively  
shape the future of  
your community.**



FLOODING



TRAFFIC



PLANNING

**Highlights:**  
**Developing the Parish Strategic Plan:**  
**Be part of the conversation as we discuss and  
prioritise strategies for the next three years.**

**& MORE**

**REGISTER YOUR INTEREST NOW !**

[clerk@bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk)

**Tel: 01283 716059**

## CORRESPONDENCE

### *GENERAL*

1. Resident copy correspondence with John Taylor High School regarding illegal and dangerous parking outside school gates.
2. Various residents responding to request for photographic evidence of flooding.
3. Bloodstock Organisers, Catton Hall – invitation to Parish forum at Walton Village Hall 4/3/24
4. Further communication from resident regarding possible licensing breaches asking for lobbying Staffs Police Commissioner

### *SCC/HIGHWAYS*

5. Storm Henk Flood Recovery Grants – details posted on Facebook, Website and Noticeboards

### *SPCA/NALC/SLCC*

6. Newsletters forwarded to all Cllrs;

## Speedwatch report

For 2023 we observed nearly 5000 cars in 16 sessions. 157 vehicles were over the reportable limit (speed limit +10% +2mph).

Julia Jessel arranged for SCC to carry out a speed survey on Bar Lane.

The results were interesting in that from our speedwatch data, we recorded just over 10% of drivers speeding (24 in a one hour session) however the SCC data found only 54 drivers at 30mph+ over the course of a week, and only 10 of these over the reportable limit.

From the map reference for the monitoring equipment position, it appears to have been placed just after the junction with Dogshead Lane. This is where drivers are either slowing to negotiate the junction, or beginning to accelerate having turned into Dogshead Lane. I do not know the range over which the recording apparatus measured the speed of the traffic. The hand held gun picks up vehicles from a distance.

Because of the low numbers recorded, SCC do not consider this to be an area where speeding is a problem.

Barton is very unlikely to be able to get SCC funding to help buy Speed Indication Devices (flashing signs which remind people to slow down).

There are still lorries using the village in spite of the weight limit. When the haulier can be identified and the vehicle registration recorded they get a letter reminding them of the weight limit and asking them to re-route their HGV. Most who respond say they will try to make sure the drivers know they shouldn't use the village.

The speedwatch team will continue to go out.

Alison Jones