

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	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	270.36		
ESBC	40,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,500.00		
LA Other	932.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	932.50		
Burial Ground	1,330.00	1,830.00	900.00	1,275.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,335.00	12,000	6,665
Fishpond	275.00	1,125.00	0.00	907.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,307.00	3,000	693
VAT	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		
Car Park	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		
BVH Sal, Tax & NIC	979.88	936.90	1,118.91	1,099.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,135.68		
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	35.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	35.00		
Grants/donations	50.00	1,463.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,513.99		
Total Income	45,022.87	5,807.60	2,543.82	3,392.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	56,767.03		

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	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	56.09		
Salaries	3,033.75	3,033.47	3,299.35	3,033.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,400.32		
HMRC	1,310.06	1,218.80	2,649.08	1,227.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,405.92		
Nest Pensions	183.99	367.98	0.00	184.57	184.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	921.07		
Admin	1,215.39	1,857.42	1,241.36	693.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,007.67		
Burial Ground	1,821.58	16.67	848.27	183.34	114.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,984.23	2,250.00	-734.23
Allotments	310.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	113.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	423.88	1,460.00	1,036.12
Fishpond	124.61	2,432.33	1,012.54	13,645.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,214.75	18,500.00	1,285.25
Donations	0.00	25.00	0.00	120.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	145.00		
P&OS	145.60	2,086.63	3,340.66	85.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,658.22	17,500.00	11,841.78
Capital Exp	0.00	0.00	0.00	583.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	583.33		
Maintenance	125.65	470.53	24.07	29.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	649.82		
Car Park	83.36	83.36	104.20	83.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	354.28		
Lengthsmen	208.40	104.20	260.50	104.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	677.30		
General payments	0.00	146.01	6.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	152.28		
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	395.96	395.96	404.19	403.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,599.78		
VEC	189.96	603.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	793.95	1,590.00	796.05
VAT	168.67	964.12	1,036.02	175.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,344.05		
Total Spend	9,316.98	15,088.44	14,270.63	20,553.11	412.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	59,641.94		

Barton under Needwood Parish Council			Bank Reconciliation as per statements at:		01-Aug-23	
Lloyds Current A/C			£	885.42		
Lloyds Deposit (Instant Access) A/C			£	85,260.00		
National Savings			£	73,922.73		
Petty Cash			£	150.00		
Total Bank Balances						£ 160,218.15
<u>Add Credits not on Statement</u>						
					£0.00	£ 160,218.15
<u>Less unrepresented payments:-</u>						
		3442		752.78		
		3445		96.00		
		3454		104.20		
		3458		120.00		
		3459		450.00		
		3460		180.00		
		3461		96.00		
		3463		121.30		
		3464		35.48		
		3465		1,227.98		
					£3,183.74	£ 157,034.41
<u>Opening Balances :-</u>			<u>Bank Statements as at 31st March 2023</u>			
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 -		Total	£ 163,596.12			
<i>Add Receipts to date</i>		£	58,067.03			
<i>Less Expenditure to date</i>		£	64,628.74			
Total Cash and Investments as at -				£ 157,034.41		
					<u>Difference</u>	-£ 0.00
RFO, S. Rumsby						

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

03/08/2023

Payee	Description	£ Value Gross	£ VAT	£ NET	
Salaries total		4,233.31		4,233.31	HR
Nest Pension Scheme		184.53		184.53	HR
HMRC		1,227.98		1,227.98	HR
Mitmark	Collinson park CCTV	96.00	16.00	80.00	P&OS
Lloyds	Bank charges	17.98		17.98	Admin
JPS	Grounds Maintenance	1,341.40	223.57	1,117.83	P&OS
Vision ICT	Email hosting annual charge	259.20	43.20	216.00	Admin
Uk Office Direct	Printer ink	95.07	15.84	79.23	Admin
Tutbury Garden Centre	Masport Mower	700.00	116.67	583.33	CapEx
M Bennett	Materials to fix benches	42.48		42.48	Maintenance
Environment Agency	Water Abstraction Fee (Annual)	97.00		97.00	Fishpond
Pennon Water Services	Allotments Water (6 mths)	114.37		114.37	Allotments
				7,994.03	

Npower Eon price change notification

w/e/f 1 September 2023

	Old Tariff	New Tariff
	All Time p/kWh	All Time p/kWh
CCTV lighting pole Collinson Park	33.80p	50.188p

Scheduled Payments

Authorised Chairman

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

Meeting of 22 May 2023 Committee Chairman appointed Cllr Ian Gilbey; Co-opted Member R. Bell; Terms of Reference reviewed with no changes.

1. 00676 - 101 Main Street : Remodelling of existing dwelling including render, part first floor part two storey part single storey front, side and rear extensions, alterations to existing boundary wall and installation of new entrance gates
The proposal is for a substantial predominantly two storey extension on its eastern side, but also incorporating a single storey rear extension. The remodelling appears to be not quite as large as that already approved under P/2022/00824, which incorporated a substantial rear extension. This proposal keeps some of the front elevations at the western side, but it loses the steep pitched roof on its eastern flank in favour of a more standard pitched gable. Interestingly, the rear elevation retains a steep pitch on its western side. The feature chimney stack also appears to have been retained. The site lies just outside the Conservation Area.

Parish Council comments

The Applicant's Heritage Statement suggests that the existing property is of little architectural merit. That may or may not be the case, but it was part of a row of similar but individually styled properties, built largely in brick in, we guess, the 1950s. They were set well back from the road and in their own way quite imposing because of their setting on large plots. In that context they provided a kind of introduction to the village. Accordingly, they contributed a certain style to the street scene. In particular, the rear elevation of this property has a certain proportional symmetry due to its steep pitches on its eastern and western sides. That 1950s style has all but disappeared due to the construction of substantial extensions to a number of properties along this south side of Main Street. These substantial extensions mean that most of these properties conform to an 'H' pattern with forward projecting extensions on each side of the front elevations. The extensions also mean that, invariably, either front lawns have also been paved over increasing surface water run-off, or garages dominate. The overall incremental effect is that whatever character those 1950s properties had, has been changed and this, in turn, has changed the character of the street scene. The replacements may or not be better architecture, but we would suggest they are more anonymous and could conceivably be anywhere. They do not seem to reflect a local distinctiveness.

The problem of this changing context is that Policy DP 1 expects development to respond positively to the context of the surrounding area as well as exhibiting a high quality design. What is the surrounding context when it is in a state of transition? How does a proposal respond to a street scene which has quite substantial additions to older properties as well as examples of those older properties? The applicants suggest that there is little architectural merit in the existing property but how can we be certain that their own proposal exhibits a high quality design in accordance with Policy DP 1?

The Heritage Statement is at pains to point out that they want a property that has a sympathetic appearance which would enhance the overall look of the property and help improve the street scene. This desire to enhance and improve is mentioned repeatedly:-

It is our view that the proposed extension will only have a positive impact;

The changes proposed can only be seen as a positive addition;

The choice of materials will compliment(sic) the conservation area and help improve the street scene;

It is our view that the proposed extension will only have a positive impact on the conservation area.

The only problem with these comments is that there is no explanation in the Heritage Statement as to how this proposal achieves these objectives. Just stating these laudable aims does not mean that they are actually achieved. From the perspective of the Parish Council, we need to have an understanding of the architect's thinking and what they are trying to achieve so that we can assess the quality of the proposal and consider whether the claims have been met. This is important because, to our minds, it goes to the heart of Policy SP 24 to achieve high quality design, and by extension Policy DP 1.

In the absence of any rationale and justification then, we would have to conclude the opposite to the Heritage Statement. We cannot understand how the proposal makes a positive contribution to the area in which it is located. It is just like the other remodelled properties along Main Street. It may do no harm in and of itself, but this does not mean it makes a positive contribution to the locality, which is the key aspect of Policy SP 24. And this is important because the policy indicates that it must make a positive contribution for it to achieve high quality design. Even though the extension is relatively modest in relation to what has previously been approved, the overall effect on the front elevation, at least, is of a substantial and very dominant property, certainly in relation to the original. Whereas before brick was the predominant material now render is creeping into the mix but with no explanation as to why? The proportion and scale of this proposal is less dominant and has

greater symmetry than what has been approved but this does not mean that it is high quality design. And one criterion of Policy SP 24 is that applicants must specify how they have met the criteria of Policy SP 24 and this the Heritage Statement fails to do so. We, therefore, believe the proposal is contrary to Policy SP 24 and Policy DP 1, and we object accordingly.

The purpose of requiring applicants to provide a heritage statement is so that the significance of the heritage assets can be described. This helps not just the Local Planning Authority but also consultees in assessing the impact of the proposal on the conservation area. The applicant's Heritage Statement merely refers to where the conservation area appraisal can be found and repeats the listing description of nearby properties. The Heritage Statement is, therefore, inadequate. If the applicants don't identify what is significant then it is difficult to judge how they have approached the issue of protecting, conserving and enhancing or indeed making a positive impact on the conservation area as they claim. We cannot comprehend the causal link between what is proposed, and the claims made for having a positive impact on the conservation area. As a result, we, therefore, must conclude that there is no evidence to indicate that the proposal meets Policy SP 25 or indeed Policy DP 5 and we object accordingly.

We have no doubt that in view of the earlier approval then ESBC will be mindful to permit this proposal as well. We would just like to urge the Borough Council to satisfy themselves that the need to make a positive contribution to the area has been met and can be justified, and hopefully explained, in the Case Officer's report, and that the conservation area can be protected, conserved and enhanced by this proposal. It would also be helpful if ESBC also explained how this proposal met the requirement for high quality design.

2. 00772 - 50 Causer Road : All over reduction of 1-1.5m to prune back from neighbouring properties and to allow dappled light through the canopy and crown raise up to 1m to clear pergola and fences of two Oak trees (TPO 388)
As with the previous application to prune these trees in 2019 we see no reason has been given on the application as to why these works are necessary to trees subject to a TPO. The trees are not reported to be diseased or causing damage to property or otherwise a danger.
We feel the officer report on P/2019/01449 is misguided in the interpretation of the requirements for a TPO in judging the balance between the public amenity value of the trees against that of householders who choose to live near the trees.
3. 00524 - Land to the rear and adj to Forest Barn Cottages Scotch Hills Lane : Erection of a pair of semi-detached and 1 detached dwelling, detached garage and annexe building and installation of septic tank
In addition to our already submitted objection to this application we wish to draw your attention to the area in front of the pair of houses facing Scotch Hills Lane. There is an area in front of these properties indicated as vehicle parking spaces. From the plans there appears to be a significant part of this area falling within the grass verge adjoining the surfaced carriageway which forms part of the highway. The location plan shows this verge though part of it is included within the boundary of "The Site".
The block plan is less clear on distinguishing carriageway and verge but the position of the "Retained Hedge" is a clear indicator of the boundary between field and highway.
We see Staffs CC Highways have been consulted over this application but may not be aware of this apparent proposed use of their land.
4. 00767 – 67 Park Road : Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions, front canopy and external alterations including cladding to the front and rear
We have no objection in principle to this application but are concerned about circulation within the property and the lack of any access to the rear garden which may not conform to DP1 requirements for the layout of the development.
We also note the loss of vehicle parking spaces for the property. The block plan hints at three vehicle parking spaces at the front of the property, most of which is now garden. If it is proposed to surface this for vehicle use we would like to see a requirement for this to be with permeable paving to provide sustainable rainwater drainage.
5. 00762 - Malverna, Sich Lane, Woodhouses : Erection of a single storey side and rear extension – *no objections*
6. 00799 - Park Corner, 83 Main Street : Erection of a two storey infill extension to the front of the property – *no objections*
7. 00756 - 19 Collinson Road : Erection of a single storey rear extension, garage conversion and porch – *no objections*

ESBC Decisions – Permissions Granted

8. 00475 - 34 Efflinch Lane : Erection of a first floor side extension including window in existing garage door opening
9. 00642 - The White House, 1 Fullbrook Avenue : demolition of existing forward projecting single garage and erection of a part two, part single storey front extension, installation of first floor side window and rear garden access in existing garden boundary wall, alterations to existing front door and ground floor wrap around corner window and replacement of all remaining existing windows

ESBC Decisions – Permissions Refused

10. 00524 - Land to the rear and adj to Forest Barn Cottages , Scotch Hills Lane : Erection of a pair of semi-detached and 1 detached dwelling, detached garage and annexe building and installation of septic tank

BARTON-UNDER-NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL.

MEETING OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACES COMMITTEE.

DATE:- 31 ^{JULY} ~~AUGUST~~ 2023.

PRESENT:- EDD SHARKEY.
STEPHEN HARLEY.
IAN GILBEY.
LINDY YOUNG.
JEANETTE TAYLOR.

OBJECTIVES:- TO DETERMINE THE DESIRED QUOTE
FOR:- 1). COLLINSON ROAD PLAY AREA FLOORING.
2). COLLINSON ROAD PLAY EQUIPMENT PAINTING.

METHOD:- ALL THREE QUOTATIONS FOR PLAY AREA
WERE DISCUSSED IN DEPTH.

ALL FOUR QUOTATIONS FOR PLAY EQUIPMENT
PAINTING WERE DISCUSSED IN DEPTH.

FURTHER DISCUSSIONS WERE RAISED ON LITTER
CONTAINERS AND BENCHES WITHIN THE PARK AREA

CONCLUSIONS:- THE RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR FOR
THE FLOORING AREAS IS J.K. CONTRACTING,
WITH THE PROVISIO OF CONFIRMATION OF
MATERIAL FOR THE FLOORING AREAS.

THE RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR FOR THE
PAINTING OF PLAY EQUIPMENT IS J.K. CONTRACTING
WITH THE PROVISIO OF CONFIRMATION OF
PAINT MATERIAL BEING SUITABLE FOR CHILDREN

BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL

VILLAGE ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES: JULY 27TH 2023.

Present: Jeannette Taylor. Lindy Young. Charley Walker. Kevin McInerney.

Item 1.

The Chair was chosen – Jeannette Taylor

Item 2.

Terms of Reference were agreed.

We had three events to discuss:

1. Teddy Bear Festival. 2. Remembrance Day Parade. 3. Christmas Tree.

We discussed in detail, having a display stand produced by the Parish Council, representing other organisations at the Teddy Bear Festival, for BARTON LIVE.

We all felt that this really needed to be a stand-alone project, as it was originally, when it was at the Youth Centre.

We will look at this again during the first part of 2024. We would discuss holding it in the Village Hall.

We discussed the outline for the Remembrance Day Parade.

Each member has a section of responsibility. This will be finalized at our August meeting.

Poppy Panels: These will be placed in situ, on the morning of Friday November 3rd.

Road Closures: They are all in place.

At our September meeting, we will invite representatives from Barton RBL branch, the vicar and marshals that are able to attend. If they are unavailable, then we will hold a separate meeting for the marshals.

Christmas Tree: this will be ordered by Jeannette during the first week of September.

This will be delivered and erected on Saturday November 25th, at 10am. The tree will then be decorated on the same day.

The TRJ school will be asked to do "Wishes" at a later date.

Tree Lights: these will be turned on December 2nd at 6pm.

All other arrangements will be discussed at our October meeting.

The meeting was then closed.

CORRESPONDENCE

GENERAL

1. Resident report of multiple lorries coming through centre of village 27 July – *Clerk forwarded evidence to Speedwatch coordinator*
2. Resident report of tree branches in danger of falling into their Church Road property – *Clerk advised and owners alerted.*
3. Resident suggestion of priority arrows/SIDs for Wales Lane/The Green to address speeding issues. – *Clerk responded*
4. Report following Facebook post re handling of wildfowl at Fishpond – *Clerk responded*
5. Staffordshire Wildlife Trust – Temporary Diversion of footpath Tuckleshome Nature Reserve – *Clerk shared on social media*
6. Resident report of windows rotten above Fat Cats in danger of falling – *Clerk report to Highways*
7. Resident report re brook clearing required Fallowfield – Brookside – *Clerk notified ESBC who have addressed but some debris left.*
8. Resident report of racial graffiti in Collinson Park – *Actioned - resident reported to police; cleaned by lengthsman*
9. Complaint received re Potters Way line marking – *Clerk responded following consultation with Chairman and Cllr Taylor; further request for information received.*

SCC/HIGHWAYS

10. Cllr Jessel: reports and communications circulated.

ESBC

11. Road Closure Notices received for Remembrance Parade and Christmas Lights events.
12. Sports facilities survey – *forwarded to P&OS*

POLICE

13. No report

SPCA/NALC/SLCC

14. SPCA – Newsletters

COMMUNITY SPEEDWATCH REPORT – August 2023

We've been out a couple of times between holidays. We had no speeders on Short Lane Sthoug lots of brakes going on). This is in spite of the householders saying it was often a problem. They were concerned that the children could be at risk from drivers pushing the limits.

On Captains Lane over 7% were speeding. But it was a quiet day.

There was a meeting at police HQ in Stafford which sadly none of the team could attend. Inspector Mark Joynson of the road policing team thanked Speedwatch. He also said they don't have the capability to do speed checks. Their efforts are more on educating bikers and speeders.

Our 2 chief inspectors Sam Rollinson and Suzanne Green talked about the role of Specials (and asked for volunteers!)

ACC Stuart Ellison said Staffs PC is improving eg answering 999 calls now 7.5 secs instead of 1min 50 and 101 calls now around 5 mins down from 20.

Speedwatch people said the road signage was poor and poorly maintained. It was pointed out that this is an Amey problem. There was some discussion about training call handlers as some seem to be unaware of speedwatch- one group dialed 999 and had a very poor response, although another team had a quick response when they were physically assaulted.

A county Councillor said SID should be at least part funded by local councillors and speedwatch should push for their involvement.

Michelle the police speedwatch coordinator is currently working without support. The police are looking to recruitment help.

Alison Jones