



I have tried and tried this month but just cannot access the BRAIN and so cannot generate my usual monthly report. I don't believe there have been any particular areas of concern spotted during the month but I can't provide the figures to back up my statement. The usual areas will continue to be patrolled, as always. I have increased the amount of Staffordshire Smart Alerts I am sending out so if any residents are concerned or would like some general advice / alerts please point them to Staffordshire Smart Alerts. It's a simple sign-up process and you'll receive emails from me as and when I can send them out (supposedly 3 times per set but that is rather frequent. I'll try to keep it relevant to the area I send them).

Abbots Bromley, I am delighted to report our first successful Section 59 seizure of a vehicle causing ASB in the Blithfield area. Here's hoping for more, or even better they move on before we have to enforce more.

Marchington, Draycott and Hanbury, I know we still have issues on the rural roads and will keep an eye out for any trouble. The local schools have also been in contact and would like me to attend more often at the start/end of the day. I will do this when possible, depending on incident commitments. I will also keep a close eye on the park in Draycott, as per your request. Hanbury, my apologies for not having the report generated especially since I know you have been requesting it. I will send you one ASAP.

Newborough and Yoxall, nothing in particular to report. I will still keep an eye out for any areas of concern and pass these on to you when I spot a pattern or trend, as discussed before Christmas with a local councillor. Now I'm using the Smart Alerts system more frequently that may be the best place to direct residents but I'll keep you posted.

Barton, Tatenhill and Rangemore, I was pleasantly surprised at the attendance at the most recent Drop In Session. They had some great ideas and I have passed these along to Councillor Ashcroft for consideration before we discuss further. Nothing for immediate action at a Parish level but we appear to be getting more people talking which is the point of the sessions. Collinson Park also appears to have calmed down somewhat but I'll keep an eye out just in case. Both John Taylors have been fantastic in terms of engagement with me, mostly because I've spent so much time there in the last few months I may as well set up a permanent office. I'll keep an eye on the up-and-coming troublemakers with an eye to educate before they become actual criminals, as best I can anyway.

I believe that covers everyone who would have a meeting this month. This is the first time I've contacted you all together (8 out of 13 councils anyway) so this could be interesting. Usually, you each have separate reports created for your areas and mentioning village specific issues. This month is a little different but I hope to have the BRAIN back as normal for next month. As always if you have any concerns or points you would like to discuss please don't hesitate to email me. I do reply as swiftly as possible and aim to provide what information I can (which I know isn't always what is asked but I do my best within the guidelines).

Many thanks,

Tim

PCSO 27951 Timothy Leathers Barton and Needwood PCSO
East Staffordshire Neighbourhood Policing Team – Shift 3
Uttoxeter Tel 101 / Mobile 07773531061

Report cyber-crime and fraud to: www.actionfraud.police.uk or call: **0300 123 2040**

You can report suspicious emails by forwarding to: report@phishing.gov.uk

You can report suspicious text messages by forwarding to: **7726**

Barton under Needwood Parish Council - Receipts and Payments Monthly Summary

2022-2023

Receipts	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Rents	725.00	75.00	37.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	200.00	1,037.50		
Interest	0.41	0.51	0.63	0.57	1.95	2.63	3.40	9.66	22.32	111.43	48.51	41.92	243.94		
ESBC	38,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	38,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	76,000.00		
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	1,065.00	450.00	955.90	2,455.00	1,100.00	255.00	705.00	2,110.00	2,550.00	1,100.00	450.00	2,285.00	15,480.90	12,000.00	3,480.90
Fishpond	966.93	225.00	180.00	625.00	319.00	162.46	117.00	117.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	72.00	2,784.39	3,000	-215.61
VAT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,862.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,862.34		
Car Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,367.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,367.88		
BVH Sal, Tax & NIC	972.50	954.45	1,022.07	960.81	1,170.17	982.60	1,049.82	1,042.84	952.96	1,005.38	1,073.04	1,400.52	12,587.16		
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Grants/donations	120.00	50.00	0.00	137.59	0.00	0.00	50.00	10,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,000.00	20,357.59		
Total Income	42,782.34	1,754.96	2,196.10	4,178.97	11,959.00	40,335.19	1,925.22	23,141.84	3,525.28	2,216.81	1,571.55	13,999.44	149,586.70		

Payments	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Bank Charges	10.25	13.25	41.51	0.00	14.35	36.75	0.00	11.04	28.48	0.00	11.25	20.80	187.68		
Salaries	2,782.10	2,781.90	3,019.15	2,781.90	2,841.33	3,082.57	2,841.33	3,562.26	3,193.73	2,786.69	2,786.49	3,180.68	35,640.13		
HMRC	1,326.30	937.38	954.18	1,050.40	868.82	917.59	1,010.29	855.86	1,353.97	1,165.04	978.47	778.12	12,196.42		
Nest Pensions	191.38	326.72	0.00	163.36	163.36	163.36	163.36	163.36	422.15	182.16	172.11	0.00	2,111.32		
Admin	1,211.78	1,722.19	566.25	617.25	296.50	1,063.68	386.08	604.39	230.30	613.71	42.60	386.14	7,740.87		
Burial Ground	16.67	33.34	1,566.91	283.47	142.91	815.01	79.20	175.01	313.66	141.67	176.23	202.21	3,946.29	3,500.00	-446.29
Allotments	310.00	0.00	571.65	542.50	100.50	141.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	212.65	34.48	1,913.45	2,439.00	525.55
Fishpond	75.00	181.26	624.70	0.00	364.08	0.00	173.48	75.00	276.78	83.00	327.27	3,319.43	5,500.00	5,500.00	0.00
Donations	0.00	25.00	0.00	120.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	170.50	0.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	385.50		
P&OS	80.00	1,302.18	1,145.94	1,015.09	80.00	2,805.27	426.03	1,027.14	80.00	80.00	2,586.90	1,491.78	12,120.33	17,300.00	5,179.67
Capital Exp	0.00	237.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	237.50		
Maintenance	0.00	109.37	56.57	30.24	0.00	0.00	46.31	0.00	937.69	20.42	33.58	222.07	1,456.25		
Car Park	76.00	76.00	95.00	76.00	76.00	95.00	76.00	76.00	95.00	76.00	76.00	95.00	988.00		
Lengthsmen	190.00	190.00	237.50	190.00	190.00	237.50	190.00	190.00	337.50	190.00	190.00	237.50	2,570.00		
General payments	0.00	54.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.00	0.00	5.25	41.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	114.00		
Projects	0.00	137.59	620.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	757.59		
BVH Contra	972.51	966.15	1,010.39	960.81	1,170.18	982.61	1,049.83	1,042.84	964.65	1,005.38	948.60	1,388.64	12,462.59		
VEC	0.00	0.00	42.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	87.80	97.97	0.00	509.97	738.72	1,000.00	261.28
VAT	22.57	275.75	758.91	250.75	90.83	889.88	116.00	247.43	323.39	48.41	575.19	876.65	4,475.76		
Total Spend	7,264.56	9,370.34	11,311.64	8,081.77	6,398.86	11,242.89	6,557.91	8,206.08	8,687.09	6,560.45	9,117.34	12,743.47	105,542.40		

Barton under Needwood Parish Council			Bank Reconciliation as per statements at:		31-Mar-23
Lloyds Current A/C			£	2,001.00	
Lloyds Deposit (Instant Access) A/C			£	87,522.39	
National Savings			£	73,922.73	
Petty Cash			£	150.00	
Total Bank Balances					£ 163,596.12
<u>Add Credits not on Statement</u>					
				£0.00	£ 163,596.12
<u>Less unrepresented payments:-</u>					
				£0.00	£ 163,596.12
<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>		£	149,586.70		
<i>Less Expenditure to date</i>		£	105,542.40		
Total Cash and Investments as at -				£ 163,596.12	
				<u>Difference</u>	£ 0.00
<u>RFO, S. Rumsby</u>					

Barton under Needwood Parish Council

Earmarked Reserves

B/f 2022/23	Description	New amount added 2022/23	Amount Spent 2022/23	Proposed c/f 2023/24	Minuted Approval Full Council
35,000.00	Car Park Maintenance and resurface	9,367.88	570.00	35,000.00	03/11/2022
500.00	Climate Fund (Fishpond	0.00	500.00	0.00	03/11/2022
700.00	Resident funding Fishpond contamination prevention	0.00	0.00	700.00	03/11/2022
5,000.00	Burial Ground Remedial Works	0.00	640.00	0.00	03/11/2022
3,000.00	Green Space Projects	0.00	0.00	0.00	03/11/2022
426.80	Full Brook Clearance funds (SCC)	0.00	0.00	426.80	03/11/2022
0.00	Toddler Park (Mercer)	0.00	0.00	10,000.00	04/01/2023
0.00	Fishpond Pegs (Cameron)	0.00	0.00	10,000.00	02/03/2023
0.00	Land Drainage P&OS	0.00	0.00	3,000.00	04/11/2022
5,625.00	Election Expenses	1,875.00	0.00	7,500.00	03/11/2022
Total Reserves				66,626.80	

Barton under Needwood Parish Council				Receipts and Payments Account			
S. Rumsby, RFO - 31 March 2023							
Receipts				2022/23		2021/22	
Local Authority Precept				£ 76,000.00		£ 64,893.28	
Local Authority Other				£ 1,865.00		£ 1,865.00	
Burial Ground				£ 15,480.90		£ 11,531.00	
Rents - Allotments, Fishing & Holland Sports				£ 3,821.89		£ 3,263.50	
Investment Income (Interest)				£ 243.94		£ 406.88	
VAT Reimbursement				£ 9,862.34		£ 6,039.80	
Other + Grants & Donations				£ 20,357.59		£ 18,494.46	
Car Park				£ 9,367.88		£ 8,503.43	
Village Hall Salary contra				£ 12,587.16		£ 7,428.40	
Credits not on statement				£ -		£ -	
				£ 149,586.70		£ 122,425.75	
Payments							
Salary / Wages				£ 49,947.87		£ 48,283.27	
Administration				£ 7,928.55		£ 8,953.44	
Burial Ground				£ 3,946.29		£ 2,326.88	
Allotments				£ 1,913.45		£ 1,016.06	
Fishpond				£ 5,500.00		£ 2,839.34	
Donations & S.137 payments				£ 385.50		£ 433.10	
Capital Expenditure				£ 237.50		£ 23,563.48	
General Payments inc Maintenance & Repairs				£ 1,570.25		£ 2,010.82	
P & OS Grasscutting/Grounds Maintenance				£ 12,120.33		£ 7,884.53	
Special Projects				£ 757.59		£ 1,573.20	
Lengthsman				£ 2,570.00		£ 835.96	
Car Park				£ 988.00		£ 2,697.30	
VAT Payable				£ 4,475.76		£ 8,246.13	
Village Hall Salary contra				£ 12,462.59		£ 5,734.48	
Vec				£ 738.72			
Unpresented cheques				£ -		£ -	
				£ 105,542.40		£ 116,397.99	
Net Income for the Year to date				£ 44,044.30		£ 6,027.76	
Add Cash Balances B/Fwd 1st April				£ 119,551.82		£ 126,504.69	
				£ 163,596.12		£ 132,532.45	
Represented By Cash Balances							
Current Account				£ 2,001.00		£ 2,001.00	
High Interest A/C (Closed)							
Deposit Accounts				£ 87,522.39		£ 56,534.85	
Petty Cash				£ 150.00		£ 150.00	
National Savings Account				£ 73,922.73		£ 73,846.60	
Total Cash Balances				£ 163,596.12		£ 132,532.45	
			Reconcillation	-£ 0.00			

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

06/04/2023

Payee	Description	£ Value Gross	£ VAT	£ NET	
Salaries total		4,622.22		4,622.22	HR
Nest		183.99		183.99	HR
HMRC		1,418.86		1,418.86	HR
Mitmark	Collinson park CCTV	96.00	16.00	80.00	P&OS
Lloyds	Bank charges	12.10		12.10	Admin Maintenance
Clerk	Expenses black bags &	6.00		6.00	Repairs
	Brasso for ashes scatterer	4.25		4.25	Burial Ground
Welters	Double Plaque	376.39	62.73	313.66	Burial Ground
Howells Funeral Directors	Refund of duplicated fees	1,300.00		1,300.00	Burial Ground
Pete's Printing	Coronation banners	75.00		75.00	VEC
Sue van Daesdonk	Expenses plaque for Trough	34.86	7.40	29.05	Burial Ground
		75.00	12.50	62.50	Burial Ground
				8,107.63	

on SVD confirmation
of receipt

Skip Hire price increase £141 to £150

Firstly, I would like to thank you for being such a loyal and consistent customer. 2022 has been another extremely challenging year in our industry, with exceptionally high-cost inflation, rapidly increasing energy cost, the Reform of Red Diesel, increase in vehicle maintenance costs and an increase in wages for our staff. Although we continue to mitigate and absorb the increased costs where possible, the pressure from external market forces and legislation have influenced the price increases to our products and services with effect from 1st April 2023.

Mini £115
Midi £150

Electricity Rate Review (Fishpond pump)

	Old Rate	New Rate
Night Rate	57.2 p/kWh	45.68 p/kWh
Day Rate	87.6 p/kWh	57.27 p/kWh
Standing Charge	123.21 pence per day	162.29 pence per day

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. [SCC/23/0012/VOC](#) – To vary permission following trial to allow factory to continue to operate 24/7 at Newbold Quarry Concrete Products Factory, Barton under Needwood
*Though we are not as yet aware of any problems arising from the current temporary 24 hour permission we are concerned about the proposal to make this permanent. We understood the original justification for the 24 hour operation was due to increased demand for quarry products, HS2 etc., requiring increased processing hours. Our concern is that with no time limit on the factory operation we could arrive at a situation where the quarry is worked out and the establishment continues to be used 24 hours a day for processing material from elsewhere brought in by road.
We would like to see a further time limit imposed on the extended operating hours so the situation can be reassessed in the future. We suggest a limit of 3 years. We would also like reassurance that the operation of this plant will cease when the quarry is worked out.*
2. [SCC/23/0012/VOC](#) – To vary permission following trial to allow factory to continue to operate 24/7 at Newbold Quarry Concrete Products Factory, Barton under Needwood – notification of public speaking arrangements at committee meeting 10am, 6/4/23
3. P/2022/01472 - Barton Marina : Erection of detached building to form 17 motel units (Use Class C1)
This is a proposal for a 17 unit suite motel located on the north bank of the Marina and to the east of the Waterfront PH. It overlooks a series of moorings. It is located on the site of 21 parking spaces and 4 disabled bays. The red outline for the development shows the access road to the site and includes some disabled parking spaces, but no general needs spaces. There appears to be no dedicated parking solely for the use of the motel and its staff, although there is some parking on the north side of the access road to the rear of the proposal.

The Planning Statement indicates that the proposal builds on the success of the marina, enhancing it with motel accommodation, to allow visitors to stay and support the existing businesses such as weddings.

Parish Council comments

Previous applications and a wider context

1.1 *For some years now, in commenting on numerous planning applications at Barton Marina, the Parish Council has been asking for some form of development brief or strategy for the site so that it can assess proposals in a wider context, as well as against sustainable development criteria. Instead, we seem to have been faced with a series of individual, incremental proposals which appear opportunistic in nature rather than as part of a considered whole. A good example of this is the present proposal which appears to sit on the same site as a planning permission for 9 craft shops (P/2014/00958). The Planning Statement refers to this permission, but it does not provide any reason as to why it was not implemented, and so we have no explanation as to why the shops have fallen out of favour. We, therefore, have no overall understanding of the applicant's vision for the site and indeed how much more development, if any, the site may be able to take.*

1.2 *More recently, we commented on a proposal for 111 additional parking spaces including 15 disabled bays and 15 electric charging points (P/2021/01087). We were told at the time that there was a need for these additional parking spaces to cope with the popularity of the Marina. Indeed, the Case Officer's report for this application noted that, "... the applicant have (sic) provided supporting information confirming that the car parks are frequently full to capacity at weekends, and numerous events are held throughout the year during which cars park on an overspill parking area....." (section on Principle of Development). This would seem to infer that all parking spaces are necessary for the functioning of the existing Marina businesses.*

1.3 *We were also told that the parking spaces would not generate additional traffic. This was also confirmed in the Case Officer's report which stated that a, "... a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan are not required as the proposal would serve an existing established use, with no additional traffic" (Section on Highway Impacts). In view of the above statements, we, therefore, find it surprising that this motel proposal involves the removal of a total of 25 parking spaces. Four disabled bays are proposed for the motel, so there is a net loss of 21 spaces. If indeed all the existing spaces are necessary to support existing businesses, then we wonder how these same businesses will be able to cope with fewer spaces, and also with the potential use of spaces being taken up by visitors and staff at the motel. Bearing in mind the need*

for parking spaces, expressed in the recent planning application, is it the best use for the space or will we have to consider a further application for additional parking at some time in the future?

1.4 *Whilst the Planning Statement again indicates that the motel will support the existing businesses, it seemingly will be doing this with fewer parking spaces. In addition, we find it hard to believe that such a use as a motel would not generate even more traffic, with a consequent need for even more parking, at the Marina.*

National Planning Policy Framework

2.1 *The Planning Statement makes the point that the NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It also states that, "It has been agreed that this is a sustainable location....."(Section 5 Planning Considerations). It does not state who was doing the agreeing! Our understanding of the sustainability of the site, however, is taken from the Planning Inspector's Planning Appeal decision into residential development at the Marina. This stated that, "Whilst these facilities would by no means deliver all the day to day needs of residents their presence adds significantly to the opportunity for reducing vehicle trips....." (Para 17 Planning Appeal Decision APP/B4310/A/14/2228678). It also stated that other facilities were available in Barton, albeit at the upper end of the walking limit. We do not feel that Applicant's interpretation of sustainable development is compatible with the Planning Inspector's reasoning.*

Policy SP 8 Development outside Settlement boundaries

3.1 *Although the Marina now supports a range of uses, the site still lies outside the settlement boundary of the village. Each planning application must be treated on its merits and, therefore, it seems to us relevant Local Plan policies must be considered, and this includes Policy SP 8. This policy states that development will not be permitted unless, amongst other things: it is essential to support the viability of an existing business or for the creation of a new business appropriate in the countryside; it is providing facilities for the general public; it is otherwise appropriate in the open countryside. Should the proposal meet these criteria then it has to go through further hoops which include having no adverse effect on existing amenities, not introducing an urban form and detailed siting should be compatible with the character of the area.*

3.2 *Clearly this would appear to be a new business, but the applicants provide no evidence that it is necessary to be located outside a settlement boundary. They do make statements to the effect that it will encourage and support the use of existing businesses but just saying that does not make it a reality. They indicate that the motel will complement existing businesses including weddings, presumably held at the Waterfront PH. But they provide no hard economic evidence to support how this will actually work in practice. What proportion of trade at the motel is expected to be used by wedding guests, for example, as opposed to more casual visitors? We cannot, therefore, conclude that it is essential to support an existing business. True, the Marina does provide facilities for the general public but, as we have seen, there is no evidence to support why this particular motel proposal is actually required and, therefore, essential.*

3.3 *In terms of the design, we understood that the design philosophy for the Marina was 'faux wharfside'. This is typified in the Waterfront PH and the adjoining waterside shops. What is proposed, has more of a feel of the south coast of England and yachting territory rather than rural Staffordshire. The use of pastel shades and cladding, for example, mean that the design philosophy is drifting away from the more industrial feel expressed by the use of brick. To be consistent with the character of the area, therefore, our view, if ESBC is mindful to approve the proposal, is that the wharfside feel should be replicated and maintained.*

3.4 *From our understanding of the applicant's Planning Statement, it provides no evidence to support the proposal as being acceptable under the terms of Policy SP 8. We cannot see that sufficient evidence has been provided that a motel is necessary to support the existing businesses. They do suggest that it will help with wedding functions, but any information or justification to support this has not been provided. There is already accommodation within Barton itself, and, bearing in mind the applicant's comments on Policy SP 14 – see below- we would have thought that they would wish to support the existing facilities in the identified rural centre. There are also two travel motels in the area on either side of the A 38, as well as accommodation in nearby Branston, so it is difficult to understand what additional offer can be provided by this proposal. It is also unclear as to whether this proposal will generate yet more traffic for the Marina. We, therefore, cannot see that this proposal meets the provisions of Policy SP 8, and we object accordingly.*

Policy SP 15 Tourism, Culture and Leisure Development

4.4 *New tourism developments including the improvement of existing ones are generally promoted by this policy, provided they support the local economy and promote the distinctive character and quality of the Borough. In order to*

achieve this, they need to respect the character and quality of the landscape and champion exemplar design. The policy also requires those activities attracting large numbers of people should be directed to accessible locations in the Borough's towns, unless the tourism initiative requires a countryside setting. New tourist accommodation outside existing settlements will only be acceptable where it will have good accessibility to existing infrastructure and not have an adverse impact on the character of the area.

4.5 *As we have seen above, there is little information about how this proposal can support the local economy. Similarly, we have noted that the proposed design is shifting from its original faux wharfeside premise, so we cannot say that it meets the need to respect local character and champion exemplar design. We have no information about how many visitors it is likely to attract and, therefore, we are uncertain as to whether such a proposal should be directed to more accessible locations. The proposal is located outside the settlement boundary, but it is not clear what good access it has to the existing infrastructure other than the applicant's stated support for existing businesses.*

4.6 *We just do not feel that there is enough information to justify the proposal under Policy SP 15 and we object accordingly.*

Policy SP 14 Rural Economy

5.1 *This policy indicates that new employment uses outside strategic villages will be permitted provided they meet the criteria in Policy SP 8 or there are exceptional circumstances. As we have noted above, we do not feel that Policy SP 8 has been met. The Applicants have not demonstrated any exceptional circumstances, so we feel that this policy has not been met and we object accordingly.*

5.2 *We must take issue with the Applicant's Planning Statement regarding this policy. It states that, "The proposed use will have economic and employment benefits and its location in a Strategic village is in accordance with the vision of the Local Plan, which sees these as being the rural centres for services, facilities and jobs acting to sustain the rural areas".*

5.3 *Barton Marina lies outside the settlement boundary of Barton and the main village facilities are nearly 2km walking distance from the site. The Applicants are, therefore, incorrect in including the Marina as part of the strategic village. Indeed, the Parish Council regards the Marina facilities as competing with the services and facilities in the village and, potentially, drawing trade away from this Strategic Village and the defined Rural Centre.*

Policy SP 35 Accessibility and Sustainable Transport

6.1 *This policy states that ESBC is committed to developing a well-integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system that connects people to jobs, services and facilities. The problem with a use such as a motel is that it is dependent on people using their private vehicles and, in that sense, it does not promote sustainable transport and is, therefore, contrary to this policy.*

6.2 *In commenting on previous applications for the Marina we have raised the issue of sustainable transport. We note, for example, that although a bus route runs along Station Road, this is still some walking distance from the Marina. We are also not aware of the promotion of any sustainable transport to the Marina's facilities. We assume that practically all users of the motel will arrive by car.*

6.3 *There are two issues of importance here. There is no information about how much traffic will be generated by the proposed motel, how much may be new visitors and how much may support existing facilities. We feel that as the businesses at the Marina have been established incrementally over time, not enough attention has been paid to the overall amount of traffic now accessing the site and its local impact. To address this concern more fully we would request that the applicants undertake a Transport Assessment in order to assess traffic impacts. In addition, whilst it may not be possible to encourage visitors to arrive other than by car – although a few may arrive by canal boat - there may be a case for employees to use more sustainable forms and, therefore, we would also request that the applicants prepare a Travel Plan so that a move to more sustainable forms of transport can be measured over time. This will also hopefully focus minds so as to promote sustainable transport measures for the Marina as a whole.*

6.4 *On a design issue, there is currently what we assume is a public footpath alongside the northern edge of the water which leads to what you might call the operational maintenance area on the north eastern edge of the Marina. The drawing showing the proposed site of the Motel seems to leave a very small strip of land alongside the front elevation of the Motel, but it is not clear if this is intended for general public use or merely for pedestrian access to the individual units. If it is*

not public access, and we can perhaps understand why due to privacy issues, then the only route for the walking public to this maintenance area is along the road at the rear of the motel. This may cause conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.

6.5 *We object to this proposal on grounds that not enough attention has been paid to promote sustainable transport and as such is contrary to Policy SP 35.*

Conclusion

7.1 *In summary we wish to emphasise again the need for an overall strategy for the Marina. Without such an overarching brief, the problem is that as the site expands and grows incrementally there is little opportunity to assess the totality of its impacts which is particularly noticeable in relation to traffic. We, therefore, request that Traffic Assessments and Travel Plans are prepared so that this issue can be fully investigated.*

7.2 *We cannot see that the proposal meets the criteria of Policy SP 8 for development outside settlement boundaries. We have so little information about the economic benefits or otherwise of the proposal that we cannot see how it meets the criteria of either Policy SP 14 and SP 15 and the need for a location outside settlement boundaries.*

4. 00186 - The Waterfront Public House, Barton Marina : Demolition of existing orangery, erection of new orangery with extension to balcony above
The relevant policy here is SP24 and its requirement for good design. The current marina frontage of The Waterfront and adjacent retail premises are of complimentary "Wharfside" design. This proposed development would be quite alien to that concept.
The proposed first floor balcony above a rebuilt orangery has prominent permanent thick vertical and horizontal columns to support the retractable roof. We see no justification for this framework being so bulky. Have any less bulky designs and materials been considered? They are visually intrusive and out of keeping with the existing building. The small central tower, a feature of this elevation, is almost completely obscured.
The orangery roof features a glass "walk on" skylight. We are unsure of the reason for this as the walls are largely glazed and capable of admitting much natural light. If the feature is to be retained there should be a requirement for it to be of opaque glass.
We do not consider this proposal to be the good design required by SP24 and therefore object
5. 00239 - 13 Brookside Road : Erection of a rear dormer extension projecting beyond existing rear elevation to form a covered canopy at ground floor level with first floor extension above, new bay window with pitched roof and installation of roof lights to the front, external alterations and render finish.
DP3 contains a criterion that, "The development would not have an overbearing impact on adjacent dwellings".
We are aware that similar extensions have been permitted in this area but feel that this proposal is large enough to have that unwelcome impact.
For this reason we object to the proposal in its current form
6. Consultation - Adoption of the East Staffordshire Borough Council Housing Choice 2023 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
7. 00260 - 53 Park Road : Erection of a two storey front extension, single storey front, side and rear extensions, raising of ridge height to existing front gable, and associated works (Revised Scheme) – *no objections*
8. 00250 - 2 Catholme Lane : Erection of a two storey front / side / rear extension, single storey rear extension and detached single storey outbuilding – *no objections*
9. 00699 - 36 Efflinch Lane : Erection of two storey side extension
Our objection to this revised scheme is similar to that to the original proposal.
The site lies within the Barton Brook Flood Zone 3.
SP27 states, "The Borough Council will require a Flood Risk Assessment for development in this area."
We do not consider the Flood Risk Notes with the application to be a Flood Risk Assessment adequate for this purpose. Barton Brook runs parallel to the side boundaries of the site and flows from the rear of the plot to the road as does the flood water when it bursts its banks. The proposed development has a footprint larger than the existing garage, which appears to be of less substantial construction, though the width may not be much greater. It would therefore increase the obstruction of this floodwater flow and in so doing may direct it further away from the brook to neighbouring properties.

We understand that no “new build” would be permitted in in Flood Risk Zones 2&3

10. 00323 - Forest Barn, Scotch Hills Lane : Application under Section 73 to vary Condition 2 (Plans) attached to the planning permission P/2020/00451 for the demolition of existing agricultural buildings and conversion of barn, including installation of roof lights, to form 3 dwellings including erection of a detached garage and installation of a septic tank to amend the parking layout and to retain portal framed barn
11. 00157 - 7 Main Street : Demolition of existing conservatory to be replaced with single storey rear\side extension
12. 00158- 7 Main Street : Listed Building Consent Demolition of existing conservatory to be replaced with single storey rear\side extension

13. Oakland Solar Farm Stakeholder Consultation

To the best of our knowledge this is the first time we have been consulted on this proposal. We, therefore, apologise in advance if the issues we set out below have already been considered. If indeed that is the case, then we would be grateful if we could be referenced to appropriate documents.

The proposal is for a large solar farm located in a kind of inverted T-shaped area to the east of Walton on Trent and to the west of Rosliston. The main body of the proposal appears to be lie in an area to the south-west of Rosliston.

As the proposal is substantial, we understand that it falls into the category of a nationally significant infrastructure project which requires a Development Consent Order and will be determined by the Secretary of State and not South Derbyshire District Council, as Local Planning Authority.

As an adjoining Staffordshire Parish Council, we admit that we are not directly affected but, having now read some of the material, we would like to set out a number of issues:-

The loss of agricultural land – From what we have read about the national guidance for solar farms, we understand that it favors previously developed, brownfield sites, industrial land and low grade agricultural land. There appears to have been no consideration of such alternative previously developed locations and their reasons for rejection before focusing on this present site. We understand the convenience of the National Grid hub nearby at the former Drakelow coal fired power station. That site is brownfield as is the nearby former Willington power station site also with National Grid connection.

We, therefore, do not know the justification for this particular site, and why greenfield land is the only option. We do not know the agricultural classification of this agricultural land. There appears to be no information about whether even with the solar farm any continued agricultural use might be viable, including any opportunity to improve biological diversity with suitable planting within the site;

The need for agricultural land vs renewable energy – As the country is currently experiencing a cost of living crisis with food inflation at a very high level, with imported food shortages much more an issue now than at this time in 2022, we would have thought that there was a priority to retain as much agricultural land as possible. We also support the move to be carbon neutral and, therefore, we feel that this proposal raises the question about how do you make a decision between two laudable objectives. The information we have received and read relates to the practicalities of the proposal and there is very little about its justification and, as a consequence, why solar power should be given precedence over an agricultural use;

Flexibility of any decision – We understand that solar farms are intended to be temporary structures and can be removed when no longer in use or required. In the light of the nation’s need for food we were wondering if conditions could be attached to Development Consent Orders so that there was some flexibility to revert all or part of the site to agriculture should it be required in the national interest;

Reflection issues – Whilst we assume that most panels will be south facing, can they be maneuvered so as to face the sun as a means of capturing the optimum energy at any point in time? If that is the case, then is the sun’s reflection on the panels likely to cause health and safety problems or hazards? We are mindful of the village being located to the west of the site;

Security issues – is there likely to be any issues regarding security fencing and any light pollution? We are aware of a solar farm at Tutbury, for example, which seems to use drones for surveillance purposes. Will that be the case in this location?

Who benefits from the energy? – Recently Government politicians supporting fracking, for example, have suggested that there may be some local cost benefits in terms of reduced energy bills for those communities supporting such proposals. Whilst we

note the community benefits fund to support local projects, could the wider benefits of the proposal to the particular local area be more clearly delineated?

Public Footpaths -We understand the footpaths in the area of the site are popular with walkers from Barton. We see on your landscaping strategy plan that the public rights of way are marked. We presume therefore that they will be retained and would like reassurance on this.

Traffic impacts – we assume that the proposal for the solar farm was partly predicated on the construction of the Walton bypass as a means of mitigating the impact of both construction and operational traffic. As a local Parish Council, we are particularly concerned at a noticeable increase in through traffic in the village in recent years. Please can you provide any assurances the construction or operational traffic will not use our village? The necessary delay to the construction of the Walton Bypass and associated river crossing and the restrictions on the A513 Chetwynd Bridge at Alrewas will require heavy construction traffic to approach the site through already largely unsuitable rural roads within South Derbyshire.

14. [SCC/23/0031/FULL-MAJ](#) for Inert waste recycling operations at Newbold Quarry, Lichfield Road
15. 00375 - 88 The Limes, Main Street : Felling of one Cypress tree and pollard one unknown mature tree back to its main limbs/stems at a height between 6 - 9 metres
16. 00363 - 40 Holland Park : Erection of a single storey rear extension, external works to include cladding and render.

ESBC Decisions – Permissions Granted

17. 22/01178 - 401 Lichfield Road : Erection of a single storey rear extension
18. 01308 - 104 Main Street : Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension
19. 00051 - 10 Meadow Rise : Erection of a two storey side extension replacing existing garage, single storey rear/side in-fill extension, and replacement of flat roofed dormer with front gable, cladding to the front and side elevations of the remodelled dormer
20. 00133 - 6 Sutton Crescent : Erection of a single storey rear extension, partial conversion of garage to form utility room and front porch
21. 00055 - Belmont, Bar Lane : Erection of a first floor side extension, part two storey part single storey side and rear extension, installation of first floor window on west elevation and Juliet balcony to rear, erection of a new replacement shed to the rear
22. 00211 - The Sidings, 94 Station Road : Felling of 21 Leylandii trees
23. 00209 - Lime tree located on footpath of Dunstall Road, Junction of Palmer Close : Prune away from residential property to give a 2 metres clearance of one Lime tree
24. 00048 - 72 Efflinch Lane : Erection of a single storey rear extension and single storey front extension to the garage
25. 00104 – 50 Station Road : Demolition of existing garage to facilitate the erection of single storey side and rear extensions and installation of first floor side window

Potters Way and Fishpond Bank Management

The Fishpond and surrounding land bordered by Barton Brook, Efflinch Lane, 33 Efflinch lane and Holland Sports Club was given to Barton Parish Council in 1962 for the purpose of sport and recreation. Holland Sports Club have a right of access to their premises over the land. The driveway is now known as Potters Way.

The problem

It has become apparent recently that the drivers of some vehicles leaving Holland Sports Club are, when faced with oncoming traffic, choosing to drive off the tarmac driveway onto the ground between the flush kerbstone and the fishpond rather than wait for the incoming vehicles to clear the surfaced driveway to make the way clear to exit. There is adequate space for vehicles to wait at either end of Potters Way and at a tarmac passing place midway along the drive.

This action, together with excessive speeds, has two consequences. The first is the increased danger to pedestrians and in particular the danger to anglers using the seven popular pegs along this section of fishpond bank.

The second has become apparent during the major work currently in progress to repair the pegs around the pond. The contractor was attending to one peg as a vehicle drove past on the bank rather than surfaced drive. The vibration caused the lower section of wooden bank support to move. Ultimately if this continues the bank will eventually collapse into the fishpond. Examination of the earth between the driveway and pond edge shows that there has been steady erosion of the ground level since the kerbstones were installed and the driveway surfaced.

It is also noted that shrubs are not present where this vehicle incursion onto the earth area are being made.

The proposed Solution

Erect physical protective barriers at the pond side of the driveway.

In time suitable planting can be done to further deter vehicle incursions in a more appropriate environmental way and for the roots to bind the earth and inhibit further movement and erosion.

Further action that may be helpful in the future is to increase the height and number of the speed humps.

These issues were discussed with the chairman and secretary of Holland Sports Club by Cllrs. Taylor and Gilbey at 11am Saturday 18th March. They fully accepted the danger of this two way traffic and were in favour of the action proposed by Barton PC. In addition they will consider providing extra signing on the lines of, "Single Track Drive" and would take action against drivers found to be at fault.

Our Fishpond Bailiffs have been consulted and are fully supportive of the proposed action.

At 3.30pm on Saturday 1st April Cllrs. Taylor and Gilbey and Fishpond Bailiffs met with James Kerry who is currently repairing and replacing dangerous fishing pegs.

He has experience of installing such driveside barriers in other locations where he has worked. He informed us of some safety requirements involving height and visibility of these protective posts. He recommends it would be safer and more clearly visible and effective to have a continuous line of posts at regular intervals. The bailiffs confirm that posts behind the pegs would not impede casting and would encourage anglers to return to and use this bank.

The drive was measured and prospective post locations were indicated and marked out. 26 posts are needed. Mr. Kerry will prepare for our consideration a quotation for the supply and installation of the posts, both for treated timber and recycled plastic.

Cllr J. Taylor

CORRESPONDENCE

GENERAL

1. Resident request for basket ball hoop at Causer Road play area – *clerk responded*
2. Resident complaint about traffic speed in general in village and HGVs using Wales Lane – *J Jessel responded*
3. Copy resident correspondence with police detailing evidence of Collinson Park alcohol use and frustrations on difficulties in reporting via Live Chat – *clerk responded*
4. Resident complaint re ASB noise in Collinson Park – *clerk responded*
5. Copy Walton Parish Council complaints re state of Station Lane, potholes and barriers – *Cllr Jessel escalated pothole repairs*
6. Barton Scouts Section Leader – request to be involved in Coronation event – *Clerk responded and details forwarded to VEC*
7. Resident concerns about road closure and access/egress from his property - *Clerk responded*
8. Resident concerns about cuttings left in Collinson Park – *Clerk responded*
9. Resident complaint about Highways trees being hacked adjacent to allotments on Hardy Close – *Clerk responded*
10. Copy correspondence regarding Christmas Star moderations to enable easier installation atop St James Church
11. Notification of unsuccessful bid for Lottery Funding for Coronation Event
12. Resident concerns re height position of ‘Main Street’ sign on Pear Tree Cottage – *Cllr J Jones taking forward with Planning to contact*
13. Resident report regarding incident in Collinson Park and request for removal of rocks by Assault Course – *Clerk sent holding response*

SCC/HIGHWAYS

14. Cllr Jessel: reports and communications circulated;

ESBC

15. Election Notices displayed
16. Road Closure Notice received

POLICE

17. Report circulated.

SPCA/NALC/SLCC

18. SPCA – Newsletters, training circulars; Election resources