

A Meeting of **Barton under Needwood Parish Council Finance Committee** was held on Monday 21st August 2023 at 6:30pm, Barton Village Hall, Crowberry Lane, Barton under Needwood.



Attendees: Steve Naylor (Chair), Jeannete Taylor, Siobhan Rumsby, James Brookes, Ed Sharkey, Lindy Young.

Did not attend: Derek Lord

1. The meeting reviewed the documents which had been circulated by the clerk in advance.
2. On the Budget versus Receipts and Payments document, there was an error which the clerk has since corrected.
3. Councillor Brookes suggested that having reviewed the documentation, taking into consideration the actual closing position from prior years, and the impact of inflation, the budget surplus (ie the amount in reserve) is not as great as had been previously discussed and is actually circa £20k.
4. Regardless of the views expressed in item (3) above, it was agreed to press ahead with replacement/refurbishment of assets which need to be addressed. Councillor Naylor agreed to raise at the next full PC meeting where the Chairs of the various committees will be asked to present a list of potential expenditures
5. It was agreed that once we have the list of items requiring refurbishment or replacement, we will then be able to assess remaining reserves and viability of undertaking significant projects.
6. If there are reserves available for major project(s), the full PC will seek to identify the best candidates, to be agreed by full PC
7. The committee discussed the creation of an asset register to document assets (possibly to include for each asset a description, an assessment of condition, cost of repair and cost of replacement). Councillor Brookes will make a proposal. The advice from the Internal Auditor on asset registers was noted. Councillor Naylor and Councillor Brookes will assist the clerk in compiling the register once format and content is agreed. The committee discussed the merits of the asset register containing low value items.
8. It was agreed that Councillor Taylor will discuss two items with the Fish Pond committee:
 - 8.1. The requirement for replacement of the barriers between the stream and Potters Way. The approximate cost will be presented to the next Finance Committee meeting.
 - 8.2. The requirement for repair of bank slippage along the Gilmour Lane side of the pond subject to professional advice
9. It was agreed that the key drivers of costs are: Village Hall; Maintenance of P&OS, Replacement of high value significant items.
10. With regard to the future requirement for a new Burial Ground, it was agreed that it is unlikely that the PC budget will be sufficient to cover the procurement of a new site especially when considering the cost of parking, turning circles, buildings etc. It was therefore agreed that we will not make a provision in the budget for such procurement.
11. It was agreed that the Clerk will create an earmarked budget to cover the operational costs associated with the existing burial ground.
12. Audit completion letter was received from Mazars. It was noted that this contained no issues or problems. It is recommended to Council that this be published on the website together with the Notice of Conclusion.
13. Next meeting is scheduled for 23rd October 2023 at 18:30.

Steve Naylor
Chair, Finance Committee, Barton Under Needwood Parish Council

The Council may in certain circumstances exclude press and members of the public due to the confidential nature of an Agenda Item and will pass a motion to that effect. Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 1 (3) & Local Government Act 1972 100A (3)(a)
Items for inclusion of the next Full Council Agenda should be submitted to the Clerk 8 days prior to the meeting.

Annual Governance and Accountability Return 2022/23 Form 3

To be completed by Local Councils, Internal Drainage Boards and other Smaller Authorities*:

- where the higher of gross income or gross expenditure exceeded £25,000 but did not exceed £6.5 million; or
- where the higher of gross income or gross expenditure was £25,000 or less but that:
 - are unable to certify themselves as exempt (fee payable); or
 - have requested a limited assurance review (fee payable)

Guidance notes on completing Form 3 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return 2022/23

1. Every smaller authority in England that either received gross income or incurred gross expenditure exceeding £25,000 **must** complete Form 3 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return at the end of each financial year in accordance with *Proper Practices*.
2. **The Annual Governance and Accountability Return is made up of three parts, pages 3 to 6:**
 - The **Annual Internal Audit Report** **must** be completed by the authority's internal auditor.
 - **Sections 1 and 2** **must** be completed and approved by the authority.
 - **Section 3** is completed by the external auditor and will be returned to the authority.
3. The authority **must** approve Section 1, Annual Governance Statement, before approving Section 2, Accounting Statements, and both **must** be approved and published on the authority website/webpage **before 1 July 2023**.
4. An authority with either gross income or gross expenditure exceeding £25,000 or an authority with neither income nor expenditure exceeding £25,000, but which is unable to certify itself as exempt, or is requesting a limited assurance review, **must** return to the external auditor by email or post (not both) **no later than 30 June 2023**. Reminder letters will incur a charge of £40 +VAT:
 - the Annual Governance and Accountability Return Sections 1 and 2, together with
 - a bank reconciliation as at 31 March 2023
 - an explanation of any significant year on year variances in the accounting statements
 - notification of the commencement date of the period for the exercise of public rights
 - Annual Internal Audit Report 2022/23

Unless requested, do not send any additional documents to your external auditor. Your external auditor will ask for any additional documents needed.

Once the external auditor has completed the limited assurance review and is able to give an opinion, the Annual Governance and Accountability **Section 1, Section 2 and Section 3 – External Auditor Report and Certificate** will be returned to the authority by email or post.

Publication Requirements

Under the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015, authorities must publish the following information on the authority website/webpage:

Before 1 July 2023 authorities **must** publish:

- Notice of the period for the exercise of public rights and a declaration that the accounting statements are as yet unaudited;
- **Section 1 - Annual Governance Statement 2022/23**, approved and signed, page 4
- **Section 2 - Accounting Statements 2022/23**, approved and signed, page 5

Not later than 30 September 2023 authorities **must** publish:

- Notice of conclusion of audit
- **Section 3 - External Auditor Report and Certificate**
- **Sections 1 and 2 of AGAR** including any amendments as a result of the limited assurance review.

It is recommended as best practice, to avoid any potential confusion by local electors and interested parties, that you also publish the Annual Internal Audit Report, page 3.

The Annual Governance and Accountability Return constitutes the annual return referred to in the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015. Throughout, the words 'external auditor' have the same meaning as the words 'local auditor' in the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.

*for a complete list of bodies that may be smaller authorities refer to schedule 2 to the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014.

Guidance notes on completing Form 3 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR) 2022/23

- The authority **must** comply with *Proper Practices* in completing Sections 1 and 2 of this AGAR. *Proper Practices* are found in the *Practitioners' Guide** which is updated from time to time and contains everything needed to prepare successfully for the financial year-end and the subsequent work by the external auditor.
- Make sure that the AGAR is complete (no highlighted boxes left empty) and is properly signed and dated. Any amendments must be approved by the authority and properly initialled.
- The authority **should** receive and note the Annual Internal Audit Report before approving the Annual Governance Statement and the accounts.
- Use the checklist provided below to review the AGAR for completeness before returning it to the external auditor by email or post (not both) no later than 30 June 2023.
- The Annual Governance Statement (Section 1) must be approved on the same day or before the Accounting Statements (Section 2) and evidenced by the agenda or minute references.
- The Responsible Financial Officer (RFO) must certify the accounts (Section 2) before they are presented to the authority for approval. The authority must in this order; consider, approve and sign the accounts.
- The RFO is required to commence the public rights period as soon as practical after the date of the AGAR approval.
- You must inform your external auditor about any change of Clerk, Responsible Financial Officer or Chairman, and provide relevant authority owned generic email addresses and telephone numbers.**
- Make sure that the copy of the bank reconciliation to be sent to your external auditor with the AGAR covers all the bank accounts. If the authority holds any short-term investments, note their value on the bank reconciliation. The external auditor must be able to agree the bank reconciliation to Box 8 on the accounting statements (**Section 2, page 5**). An explanation **must** be provided of any difference between Box 7 and Box 8. More help on bank reconciliation is available in the *Practitioners' Guide**.
- Explain fully significant variances in the accounting statements on **page 5**. Do not just send a copy of the detailed accounting records instead of this explanation. The external auditor wants to know that you understand the reasons for all variances. Include complete numerical and narrative analysis to support the full variance.
- If the bank reconciliation is incomplete or variances not **fully** explained then additional costs may be incurred.
- Make sure that the accounting statements add up and that the balance carried forward from the previous year (Box 7 of 2022) equals the balance brought forward in the current year (Box 1 of 2023).
- The Responsible Financial Officer (RFO), on behalf of the authority, **must** set the commencement date for the exercise of public rights of 30 consecutive working days which **must** include the first ten working days of July.
- The authority **must** publish on the authority website/webpage the information required by Regulation 15 (2), Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015, including the period for the exercise of public rights and the name and address of the external auditor **before 1 July 2023**.

Completion checklist – 'No' answers mean you may not have met requirements		Yes	No
All sections	Have all highlighted boxes have been completed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Has all additional information requested, including the dates set for the period for the exercise of public rights , been provided for the external auditor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Internal Audit Report	Have all highlighted boxes been completed by the internal auditor and explanations provided?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Section 1	For any statement to which the response is 'no', has an explanation been published?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Section 2	Has the Responsible Financial Officer signed the accounting statements before presentation to the authority for approval?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Has the authority's approval of the accounting statements been confirmed by the signature of the Chairman of the approval meeting?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Has an explanation of significant variations been published where required?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Has the bank reconciliation as at 31 March 2023 been reconciled to Box 8?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Has an explanation of any difference between Box 7 and Box 8 been provided?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sections 1 and 2	Trust funds – have all disclosures been made if the authority as a body corporate is a sole managing trustee? NB: do not send trust accounting statements unless requested.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Governance and Accountability for Smaller Authorities in England – a Practitioners' Guide to Proper Practices*, can be downloaded from www.nalc.gov.uk or from www.ada.org.uk

Annual Internal Audit Report 2022/23

Barton-under-Needwood Parish Council

www.bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk

During the financial year ended 31 March 2023, this authority's internal auditor acting independently and on the basis of an assessment of risk, carried out a selective assessment of compliance with the relevant procedures and controls in operation and obtained appropriate evidence from the authority.

The internal audit for 2022/23 has been carried out in accordance with this authority's needs and planned coverage. On the basis of the findings in the areas examined, the internal audit conclusions are summarised in this table. Set out below are the objectives of internal control and alongside are the internal audit conclusions on whether, in all significant respects, the control objectives were being achieved throughout the financial year to a standard adequate to meet the needs of this authority.

Internal control objective	Yes	No*	Not covered**
A. Appropriate accounting records have been properly kept throughout the financial year.	✓		
B. This authority complied with its financial regulations, payments were supported by invoices, all expenditure was approved and VAT was appropriately accounted for.	✓		
C. This authority assessed the significant risks to achieving its objectives and reviewed the adequacy of arrangements to manage these.	✓		
D. The precept or rates requirement resulted from an adequate budgetary process; progress against the budget was regularly monitored; and reserves were appropriate.	✓		
E. Expected income was fully received, based on correct prices, properly recorded and promptly banked; and VAT was appropriately accounted for.	✓		
F. Petty cash payments were properly supported by receipts, all petty cash expenditure was approved and VAT appropriately accounted for.	✓		
G. Salaries to employees and allowances to members were paid in accordance with this authority's approvals, and PAYE and NI requirements were properly applied.	✓		
H. Asset and investments registers were complete and accurate and properly maintained.	✓		
I. Periodic bank account reconciliations were properly carried out during the year.	✓		
J. Accounting statements prepared during the year were prepared on the correct accounting basis (receipts and payments or income and expenditure), agreed to the cash book, supported by an adequate audit trail from underlying records and where appropriate debtors and creditors were properly recorded.	✓		
K. If the authority certified itself as exempt from a limited assurance review in 2021/22, it met the exemption criteria and correctly declared itself exempt. (If the authority had a limited assurance review of its 2021/22 AGAR tick "not covered")			✓
L. The authority published the required information on a website/webpage up to date at the time of the internal audit in accordance with the relevant legislation.	✓		
M. In the year covered by this AGAR, the authority correctly provided for a period for the exercise of public rights as required by the Accounts and Audit Regulations (during the 2022-23 AGAR period, were public rights in relation to the 2021-22 AGAR evidenced by a notice on the website and/or authority approved minutes confirming the dates set).	✓		
N. The authority has complied with the publication requirements for 2021/22 AGAR (see AGAR Page 1 Guidance Notes).	✓		
O. (For local councils only) Trust funds (including charitable) – The council met its responsibilities as a trustee.	Yes ✓	No 	Not applicable

For any other risk areas identified by this authority adequate controls existed (list any other risk areas on separate sheets if needed).

Date(s) internal audit undertaken

22/11/2022

18/04/2023

Name of person who carried out the internal audit

A.Toplis/K.Squires-Toplis Associates Ltd

Signature of person who carried out the internal audit



Date

19/04/2023

***If the response is 'no' please state the implications and action being taken to address any weakness in control identified (add separate sheets if needed).**

****Note:** If the response is 'not covered' please state when the most recent internal audit work was done in this area and when it is next planned; or, if coverage is not required, the annual internal audit report must explain why not (add separate sheets if needed).

Section 1 – Annual Governance Statement 2022/23

We acknowledge as the members of:

BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL

our responsibility for ensuring that there is a sound system of internal control, including arrangements for the preparation of the Accounting Statements. We confirm, to the best of our knowledge and belief, with respect to the Accounting Statements for the year ended 31 March 2023, that:

	Agreed		
	Yes	No*	'Yes' means that this authority:
1. We have put in place arrangements for effective financial management during the year, and for the preparation of the accounting statements.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	prepared its accounting statements in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations.
2. We maintained an adequate system of internal control including measures designed to prevent and detect fraud and corruption and reviewed its effectiveness.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	made proper arrangements and accepted responsibility for safeguarding the public money and resources in its charge.
3. We took all reasonable steps to assure ourselves that there are no matters of actual or potential non-compliance with laws, regulations and Proper Practices that could have a significant financial effect on the ability of this authority to conduct its business or manage its finances.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	has only done what it has the legal power to do and has complied with Proper Practices in doing so.
4. We provided proper opportunity during the year for the exercise of electors' rights in accordance with the requirements of the Accounts and Audit Regulations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	during the year gave all persons interested the opportunity to inspect and ask questions about this authority's accounts.
5. We carried out an assessment of the risks facing this authority and took appropriate steps to manage those risks, including the introduction of internal controls and/or external insurance cover where required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	considered and documented the financial and other risks it faces and dealt with them properly.
6. We maintained throughout the year an adequate and effective system of internal audit of the accounting records and control systems.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	arranged for a competent person, independent of the financial controls and procedures, to give an objective view on whether internal controls meet the needs of this smaller authority.
7. We took appropriate action on all matters raised in reports from internal and external audit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	responded to matters brought to its attention by internal and external audit.
8. We considered whether any litigation, liabilities or commitments, events or transactions, occurring either during or after the year-end, have a financial impact on this authority and, where appropriate, have included them in the accounting statements.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	disclosed everything it should have about its business activity during the year including events taking place after the year end if relevant.
9. (For local councils only) Trust funds including charitable. In our capacity as the sole managing trustee we discharged our accountability responsibilities for the fund(s)/assets, including financial reporting and, if required, independent examination or audit.	Yes	No	N/A
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			has met all of its responsibilities where, as a body corporate, it is a sole managing trustee of a local trust or trusts.

***Please provide explanations to the external auditor on a separate sheet for each 'No' response and describe how the authority will address the weaknesses identified. These sheets must be published with the Annual Governance Statement.**

This Annual Governance Statement was approved at a meeting of the authority on:

01/06/2023

and recorded as minute reference:

7.1.5

Signed by the Chairman and Clerk of the meeting where approval was given:

Chairman

Clerk




www.bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk

Section 2 – Accounting Statements 2022/23 for


BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL

	Year ending		Notes and guidance
	31 March 2022 £	31 March 2023 £	
1. Balances brought forward	132,532	119,552	Total balances and reserves at the beginning of the year as recorded in the financial records. Value must agree to Box 7 of previous year.
2. (+) Precept or Rates and Levies	63,876	76,000	Total amount of precept (or for IDBs rates and levies) received or receivable in the year. Exclude any grants received.
3. (+) Total other receipts	64,435	73,587	Total income or receipts as recorded in the cashbook less the precept or rates/levies received (line 2). Include any grants received.
4. (-) Staff costs	52,503	52,518	Total expenditure or payments made to and on behalf of all employees. Include gross salaries and wages, employers NI contributions, employers pension contributions, gratuities and severance payments.
5. (-) Loan interest/capital repayments	0	0	Total expenditure or payments of capital and interest made during the year on the authority's borrowings (if any).
6. (-) All other payments	88,788	53,025	Total expenditure or payments as recorded in the cashbook less staff costs (line 4) and loan interest/capital repayments (line 5).
7. (=) Balances carried forward	119,552	163,596	Total balances and reserves at the end of the year. Must equal (1+2+3) - (4+5+6).
8. Total value of cash and short term investments	119,552	163,596	The sum of all current and deposit bank accounts, cash holdings and short term investments held as at 31 March – To agree with bank reconciliation.
9. Total fixed assets plus long term investments and assets	1,319,624	1,322,917	The value of all the property the authority owns – it is made up of all its fixed assets and long term investments as at 31 March.
10. Total borrowings	0	0	The outstanding capital balance as at 31 March of all loans from third parties (including PWLB).

For Local Councils Only	Yes	No	N/A	
11a. Disclosure note re Trust funds (including charitable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Council, as a body corporate, acts as sole trustee and is responsible for managing Trust funds or assets.
11b. Disclosure note re Trust funds (including charitable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The figures in the accounting statements above do not include any Trust transactions.

I certify that for the year ended 31 March 2023 the Accounting Statements in this Annual Governance and Accountability Return have been prepared on either a receipts and payments or income and expenditure basis following the guidance in Governance and Accountability for Smaller Authorities – a Practitioners' Guide to Proper Practices and present fairly the financial position of this authority.

Signed by Responsible Financial Officer before being presented to the authority for approval


Date 01/06/2023

I confirm that these Accounting Statements were approved by this authority on this date:

01/06/2023

as recorded in minute reference:

7.1.6

Signed by Chairman of the meeting where the Accounting Statements were approved



Section 3 – External Auditor's Report and Certificate 2022/23

In respect of

Barton Under Needwood Parish Council

1 Respective responsibilities of the auditor and the authority

Our responsibility as auditors to complete a **limited assurance review** is set out by the National Audit Office (NAO). A limited assurance review is **not a full statutory audit**, it does not constitute an audit carried out in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (UK & Ireland) and hence it **does not** provide the same level of assurance that such an audit would. The UK Government has determined that a lower level of assurance than that provided by a full statutory audit is appropriate for those local public bodies with the lowest levels of spending.

Under a limited assurance review, the auditor is responsible for reviewing Sections 1 and 2 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return in accordance with NAO Auditor Guidance Note 02 (AGN 02) as issued by the NAO on behalf of the Comptroller and Auditor General. AGN 02 is available from the NAO website – <https://www.nao.org.uk/code-audit-practice/guidance-and-information-for-auditors/>.

This authority is responsible for ensuring that its financial management is adequate and effective and that it has a sound system of internal control. The authority prepares an Annual Governance and Accountability Return in accordance with *Proper Practices* which:

- summarises the accounting records for the year ended 31 March 2023; and
- confirms and provides assurance on those matters that are relevant to our duties and responsibilities as external auditors.

2 External auditor's limited assurance opinion 2022/23

On the basis of our review of Sections 1 and 2 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return, in our opinion the information in Sections 1 and 2 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return is in accordance with Proper Practices and no other matters have come to our attention giving cause for concern that relevant legislation and regulatory requirements have not been met.

Other matters not affecting our opinion which we draw to the attention of the authority:

Not applicable

3 External auditor certificate 2022/23

We certify that we have completed our review of Sections 1 and 2 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return, and discharged our responsibilities under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014, for the year ended 31 March 2023.

*We do not certify completion because:

Not applicable

External Auditor Name

Mazars LLP, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 1DF

External Auditor Signature

Mazars LLP

Date

3 August 2023

BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL

Notice of conclusion of the audit

Annual Return for the year ended 31st March 2023

Section 25 of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014

Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2015

	Notes
<p>1. The audit of accounts for the Council/Meeting (a) for the year ended 31 March 2023 has been concluded.</p> <p>2. The Annual Governance and Accountability Return is available for inspection by any local government elector of the area of the Council /Meeting (a) on application to:</p> <p>(b) Siobhan Rumsby, RFO/Clerk Barton under Needwood Parish Council, Village Hall, Crowberry Lane, Barton under Needwood, Burton upon Trent, DE13 8AF clerk@bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk www.bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk</p> <p>2. Copies will be provided to any local government elector on payment of £0.60p (c) for each copy of the Annual Return.</p> <p>Announcement made by: (d) Siobhan Rumsby</p> <p>Date of announcement: (e) _____ 8 September 2023_____</p>	<p>(a) Delete as appropriate</p> <p>(b) Insert name, position and address of the person to whom local government electors should apply to inspect the Annual Return</p> <p>(c) Insert a reasonable sum for copying costs</p> <p>(d) Insert name and position of person placing the notice</p> <p>(e) Insert date of placing of the notice</p>

[illegible]

Barton under Needwood Parish Council			Bank Reconciliation as per statements at:		16-Aug-23
Lloyds Current A/C			£	2,000.00	
Lloyds Deposit (Instant Access) A/C			£	82,204.24	
National Savings			£	73,922.73	
Petty Cash			£	150.00	
Total Bank Balances					£ 158,276.97
<u>Add Credits not on Statement</u>					
				£0.00	£ 158,276.97
<u>Less unrepresented payments:-</u>					
		3442	752.78		
		3445	96.00		
		3459	450.00		
		3461	96.00		
				£1,394.78	£ 156,882.19
<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>		£	58,182.63		
<i>Less Expenditure to date</i>		£	64,896.56		
Total Cash and Investments as at -			£ 156,882.19		
				<u>Difference</u>	-£ 0.00
<u>RFO, S. Rumsby</u>					

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	115.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	385.96		
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	2,630.00	1,830.00	900.00	1,275.00	2,375.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,010.00	12,000	2,990
Fishpond	275.00	1,125.00	0.00	907.00	329.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,636.00	3,000	364
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	1,092.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,228.33		
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	46,322.87	5,807.60	2,543.82	3,392.74	3,912.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	61,979.28		

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	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	92.54		
Salaries	3,033.75	3,033.47	3,299.35	3,033.75	3,287.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15,688.07		
HMRC	1,310.06	1,118.40	2,509.48	1,092.98	1,476.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,507.80		
Nest Pensions	183.99	367.98	0.00	184.57	184.53	186.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,107.83		
Admin	1,215.39	1,857.42	380.03	693.50	1,012.26	12.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,171.06		
Burial Ground	1,821.58	16.67	848.27	183.34	318.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,188.51	2,250.00	-938.51
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	195.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,409.75	18,500.00	1,090.25
Donations	0.00	25.00	0.00	570.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	595.00		
P&OS	145.60	2,086.63	3,340.66	85.33	2,235.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,893.88	17,500.00	9,606.12
Capital Exp	0.00	0.00	0.00	583.33	0.00	141.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	725.25		
Maintenance	125.65	470.53	24.07	29.57	663.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,312.82		
Car Park	83.36	83.36	965.63	83.36	759.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,974.91		
Lengthsmen	208.40	208.40	260.50	208.40	260.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,146.20		
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	835.76	793.98	972.01	975.17	1,006.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,583.87		
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	928.26	28.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,300.69		
Total Spend	9,756.78	15,490.26	14,698.95	21,543.81	12,460.51	387.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	74,338.30		

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

07/09/2023

Payee	Description	£ Value Gross	£ VAT	£ NET
Salaries total		4,462.45		4,462.45 HR
Nest Pension Scheme		186.76		186.76 HR
HMRC		1,227.98		1,227.98 HR
Mitmark	Collinson park CCTV	96.00	16.00	80.00 P&OS
Lloyds	Bank charges	18.47		18.47 Admin
Hulls Environmental	Pest Control	98.00		98.00 Fishpond
SPCA	Councillors Training	108.00	18.00	90.00 Admin
Mazars	External Audit	504.00	84.00	420.00 Admin
Gilvar Lining	Potters Way & Carpark	1,581.60	263.60	1,318.00 Maintenance & CP
Eyden Signs	Chairmans Board	36.00	6.00	30.00 Maintenace
SLCC	Annual membership	222.00		222.00 Admin
McAfee	Annual Subscription	109.99		109.99 Admin
Amazon (Tannas Ltd)	Epson Printer WF 7830	170.30	28.38	141.92 Capex
SSE Swalec	Electricity	373.23	17.87	355.36 Fishpond
				8,760.93

Notices

Npower Eon price change notification

w/e/f 1 September 2023

CCTV lighting pole Collinson Park

Old Tariff

All Time p/kWh

33.80p

New Tariff

All Time p/kWh

50.188p

SSE - Energy Bill Relief Scheme

Notification of discount figures included in tariff to 31/3/23

Discount applied

£211.79

BHIB Notice - Council insurance

Business has been integrated into Clear Group, rebranded 'Clear Councils'

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

1. 00700 - 55 Wales Lane : Demolition of existing garage and erection of a detached building to form Annex to be used as ancillary dwelling – *no objections*
2. 00814 - Land South Small Meadow Lane, East Dunstall Road : Erection of 1no. self-build detached 4-bed dwelling, detached single storey garage, detached garden room, installation of septic tank and associated works/landscaping – *see objections attached*
3. 00727 - Yew Tree House, Yoxall Road, Woodhouses : change of use from Class C3 dwellinghouse to form a small-scale childrens care home Class C2

This location is on a "B" road with an occasional bus service, so cannot be considered a sustainable location as most if not all journeys would be by motor vehicle.

This application for a change of use is well outside settlement boundaries and as such is covered by SP8. We cannot see how it complies with the criteria set out for development outside settlement boundaries. Even if it did it would be necessary to show the development does not adversely affect the amenities enjoyed by existing land users, including, in the case of proposals for development close to an existing settlement, the occupiers of residential and other property within that settlement. "Settlement" must surely include the residents of the hamlet of Woodhouses.

The applicants have stated that the residential home will cause no problem though we do not see evidence to justify this. Can the applicants show a track record of having run similar establishments satisfactorily in such a rural location?

We made enquiries about a comparable home in the village of Newborough that was established with similar assurances but has caused considerable nuisance to other residents. An Ofsted inspection of this establishment in November 2022 judged it to be "Inadequate". On reading this report we see that the registered provider is shown as Olive Tree Residential Care Limited, as is the current applicant.

We therefore object to this application in its current form as being contrary to SP8 of the Local Plan.

4. 00895 - 55 Sutton Crescent : Crown reduction by 1.5 meters, crown clean to remove dead and potential disease bearing limbs, reduce eastern structural limb to 1.5m stub and western structural limb to 1m stub of one Oak Tree (TPO 318)

A similar application P/2023/00424, was refused for this reason,

"1 The tree is a healthy specimen which occupies a prominent position in its surroundings and is of high visual amenity value due to its visibility. Insufficient information has been provided in respect of the proposed works and no arboricultural evidence has been submitted to justify the proposed works to the tree which would irreparably damage its form and appearance to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality contrary to the Local Plan Policy DP8, the National Planning Policy Framework, and guidance contained in the National Planning Practice Guidance."

This agreed with our then objection,

"This is a mature healthy tree providing valuable visual and habitat amenity to the area thus justifying TPO318.

The applicant indicates that there is no concern over the condition of the tree and it is not causing damage to property."

It is clear that the tree has, at some time in the past, had limbs lopped from the trunk. This may well have been done by the developer of the estate several years ago. Oak tree heartwood is durable and there is no sign of decay from this old work. As before the applicant does not claim the tree is diseased or dangerous or causing damage to property. There is no report from a professional arboriculturist to justify any work to this tree.

We therefore object to this application in similar terms to the previous one.

This is a mature healthy tree providing valuable visual and habitat amenity to the area thus justifying TPO318.

The applicant indicates that there is no concern over the condition of the tree and it is not causing damage to property.

5. 00793 - Unit 1 3, Bell Lane : Conversion and alterations to existing workshops to form 2 no residential dwellings including rooflights to Dwelling A and single storey rear extension to the adjacent dwelling, Croft Side and external staircase to garage to Dwelling B – *see objections attached*
6. 00921 - Midlands Co-operative Society, Crowberry Lane : Application under Section 73 to vary condition 22 attached to planning application P/2010/01451/MB for the erection of supermarket with associated car parking, delivery area and formation of a vehicular access to vary the opening hours to 06:30 until 23:00 Monday to Saturday and 06:30 until 22:00 Sundays and Bank Holidays

7. 00918 - Barns at Forest Thorn Farm, 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 include a detached double garage to serve Plot 3 – *no objection*
8. 00904 - 173 Efflinch Lane : Remodelling of existing dwelling to include first floor front & rear extensions, two storey front & side extension, single storey front extension and dormer windows to the front and rear – *no objection*
9. 00911 - Blakenhall Farm : Retention of 17 self-storage containers
Though we do have concerns about an apparent increase in large vehicles using narrow rural roads to access the Blakenhall site we must accept the applicant's assurances that such vehicles are not visiting these storage containers. There remains some confusion surrounding the actual total of these containers but we assume this application is to cover all those currently on site including those previously approved.

We therefore offer no objection to this application but, if it is permitted, we ask that to avoid further piecemeal increases in containers on this site a condition be imposed that any further development cannot be done without specific planning consent

10. DM0T/2023/1024 - Land at SK2420 2230, Walton Road, Drakelow, Swadlincote : The modification of a planning obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated 24th August 2021 and relating to permission ref. DMPA/2020/1460 (seeking to reset trigger for Walton Bypass to allow for it to be delivered prior to occupation of 785 dwellings on the Drakelow Estate) – *Objection:*

Proposal

The modification of a planning obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated 24th August 2021 and relating to permission ref. DMPA/2020/1460 (seeking to reset trigger for Walton Bypass to allow for it to be delivered prior to occupation of 785 dwellings on the Drakelow Estate)

The applicant Countryside Partnerships (CP) has planning consent for development at Drakelow Estate. The scale of development is such that it has an impact on the road network considered to be unacceptable. As a result, CP has committed to providing the Walton Bypass which will provide a more direct route from the development to the A38. This enables traffic to be diverted away from Walton village and the closure of Station Lane to vehicular traffic over the temporary river Trent Bailey bridge towards the A38 and Barton under Needwood.

Since development has been permitted to commence prior to the opening of the bypass, the section 106 agreement included an obligation for the Walton Bypass to be implemented prior to the occupation of 100 dwellings. Given lack of progress on delivering the bypass, in 2016 CP secured a partial lifting of this constraint with the trigger point for delivery of the Walton Bypass raised to 400 occupations. This increase was accepted in part, on the evidence of impact on the local road network in the form of a traffic modelling study.

There has subsequently been recent progress in CP engaging with the County Council Highway Authorities to ensure a design for the bypass such that it is compliant with current highway standards and capable of adoption as a public highway. There has also been recent progress in CP engaging with the Environment Agency with regard to construction of the bypass within the river Trent floodplain and flood risk impacts. However, based on the current position. CP estimates that the bypass will not be available until 2025.

With the current trigger of 400 occupations the delay in opening of the bypass until 2025, would result in development having to pause and be mothballed. In order to avoid this scenario CP are applying for a further raising of the trigger to 785 occupations. CP have provided evidence, in the form of a new traffic modelling study, which is intended to demonstrate that the impact of 785 occupations on the local road network is acceptable. CP state that they remain wholly committed to delivering the Walton bypass scheme.

The section of Station Lane within Staffordshire is within the Barton Parish Council (BPC) boundary. Barton is also impacted by traffic passing through the village which could be worsened by additional traffic generated by the CP development. Barton is also subject to flooding from the Barton Brook, in part caused by flood levels on the river Trent.

The position of BPC is that it is supportive of the provision of the Walton Bypass given its local benefits, in particular, the closure of Station Lane to vehicles and its conversion to non-motorised use. However, BPC support is conditional on

- *Flood water levels on the upstream side of the bypass must not increase such that flood risk to Barton is increased*

- *Station lane is closed to through traffic and converted to non-motorised use*
- *The bypass is available for use during all but exceedance flood events on the river Trent.*

With regard to raising of the trigger to 785 occupations, BPC has major concerns due to the potential impact on pedestrians using Station Lane and congestion at the Bailey bridge. It is noted that CP has provided a traffic modelling study in support of their application. However, BPC does not have the expertise to determine the accuracy of this report. Clearly an additional 385 occupations will generate more traffic movements.

Although BPC welcomes the CP stated commitment to delivering the Walton bypass scheme, there does not appear to be any mechanism that guarantees its provision. A situation could arise in which the 785 occupations are complete and the development does not proceed further.

Given the above considerations, BPC must object to the raising of the trigger above the current 400 occupations.

Our objection could be removed if Staffordshire County Council as Highway Authority confirm that

- *A mechanism is in place which ensures the funding and completion of the Walton bypass*
- *The additional 385 occupations will not create delays and build up of traffic at the river Trent bailey bridge or create greater risk to pedestrians using Station Lane*

BPC is represented on the Drakelow Bridge and Steer Group and will continue to work with all parties to secure the delivery of the Walton bypass, which is an acknowledged required requirement, consequent on the Drakelow Park development.

ESBC Decisions – Permissions Granted

1. 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)
2. 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
3. 00756 - 19 Collinson Road : Erection of a single storey rear extension, garage conversion and porch
4. 00799 - Park Corner, 83 Main Street : Erection of a two storey infill extension to the front of the property

Correspondence

5. Representation and planning statement re land at Dunstall Road.
6. Resident urging BPC representation on delay to Walton Bridge and application regarding modifications to Drakelow estate – occupation clause 785 houses. DMOT/2023/1024 - *Clerk responded*
7. Copy resident objections to P/2023/00814 – *Clerk responded*

P/2023/00814**Erection of a self-build, two storey, four bed detached house with a detached single storey garage, detached garden room, installation of a septic tank and associated landscaping etc, at junction of South Small Meadow Lane and Dunstall Road**

This site was previously the subject of a planning application (P/2022/00048) for permission in principle for two dwellings. The application was subject to the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 whereby the Local Planning Authority must determine whether to grant permission in principle in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The scope of the assessment of the application was limited to location, land use and the amount of development proposed. ESBC refused the application on the basis that as the site was located outside the settlement boundary and, as such, the development would be unacceptable and an unnecessary form of development in the open countryside.

The proposed property lies immediately to the north of the settlement boundary for the village, and also the Conservation Area. This proposal is now just for one dwelling on the north-east corner of the site. The property forms an L-shape, on its side, and this is emphasized by the location of a detached garage. What is called a detached garden room in the planning application description although referred to as a pavilion/home office on the site plan is located on the eastern boundary. A septic tank is also proposed further to the south but also on this eastern boundary. Access is from off Dunstall Road and uses the existing access into the Deer House. The meadow area between the access road and Dunstall Road lies within the conservation area. The long length of the L-shape aligns or runs parallel to Small Meadow Lane, but does not front onto it. It is essentially a large, detached property, which has a courtyard feel and is constructed of brick and timber cladding. What you might call a meadow area fronting the junction with Dunstall Road and Small Meadow Lane remains undeveloped although is retained in the applicant's ownership.

Parish Council Comments

1.1 *The Parish Council objected to the previous planning application on the grounds of it being located outside the settlement boundary and, therefore, contrary to Policy SP 8 for development in the countryside. We also objected on heritage grounds being contrary to policies SP 25 and DP 5. We were informed in the case officer's report, however, that concerns regarding the conservation area and listed buildings were not material in this case as the Local Planning Authority could only deal with the principle of development. We are, therefore, grateful that this application can now be assessed against the full range of planning policy criteria.*

1.2 *Precious little information accompanied the previous application and so there were no material considerations supporting the proposal for this location outside both the settlement boundary and the Conservation Area. Accompanying this application there is a plethora of information including a Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement and a Heritage Statement. We would praise the applicants, in particular, for the preparation of a very comprehensive and detailed Heritage Statement. (As an aside, so many Heritage Statements we are presented with fail in their basic objective of describing the significance of any heritage assets, that it is gratifying to read such a detailed and well researched document). The previous application was refused in principle for 2 dwellings. There appears to be no information in all the documentation as to why two dwellings are not now favoured. Only one dwelling is now being pursued other and this is for a self-build proposal. We assume, therefore, that the previous application was purely speculative.*

1.3 *There is a discrepancy in the documents as between the description of either a garden room or a home office pavilion. It would be helpful to have some clarity on this issue. A garden room, to our mind, is an area for casual relaxation, whereas the latter is obviously intended as a place of work. Could not this facility be provided within the design of the property itself rather than by its very nature, with presumably office equipment, upsetting the ambience of the landscaped location?*

1.4 *According to legislation you determine planning applications in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Having read through the majority of the accompanying information the Parish Council still wishes to retain its original objection. We believe that the proposal is contrary to Policy SP 2 Settlement Hierarchy, Policy SP 8 Development outside settlement boundaries, SP 25 Historic Environment and PD 5 Protecting the Historic Environment*

Policy SP 2 Settlement Hierarchy

2.1 *This policy sets out the development strategy which includes a hierarchy of settlements, with the majority of new development being directed to Burton and Uttoxeter. Smaller allocations are identified for four Strategic Villages, Barton, Rolleston, Tutbury and Rocester. Further down the hierarchy are Local Service Villages and Small Villages and Other Settlements. Development within these larger settlements is to be concentrated within the defined settlement boundary. Any development located outside of the settlement boundary is regarded as in the open countryside where according to Policy SP 2 development will be permitted only in exceptional circumstances.*

2.2 *According to the Settlement Boundary Review Topic Paper which accompanied the Local Plan, Strategic Villages are intended to accommodate a strategic housing allocation to meet need generated by the village, its rural hinterland and also to meet some needs of the Borough as a whole. In addition, the strategic villages also have a windfall allowance to cater for opportunities that arise adventitiously throughout the plan period. Such development, however, is likely to be on brownfield sites and to lie within the settlement boundaries. The strategic allocation for Barton has been more than superseded since the Local Plan was adopted. We have requested information on windfall developments from ESBC and assume that the windfall allowance has also been superseded. If indeed that is the case, then we believe this amply demonstrates that there are development opportunities and presumably there is no reason why such sites should not continue coming forward in the future. This may well include self-build proposals. This would, therefore, suggest that there is no reason to permit proposals outside the settlement boundary to meet a perceived self-build need.*

2.3 *ESBC considered a range of issues in drawing up the settlement boundaries and concluded that there was sufficient infill and redevelopment opportunities within the settlement boundary to accommodate the required level of growth. A settlement boundary was, therefore, drawn on the Proposals Map for the village with the intention of accommodating that future growth.*

2.4 *The settlement boundary along Dunstall Road is defined fairly generously on its eastern side as it includes the curtilage and grounds of the Deer House and Barton Hall. A much tighter boundary could have been drawn to include just the buildings but to exclude their grounds. Inclusion of the curtilage, however, demonstrates the character of development in this area which consists of large properties on substantial plots.*

2.5 *The application site lies outside, although immediately adjoining the northern limit of the settlement boundary for the village. In planning policy terms this means that it falls within the open countryside.*

2.6 *The Government requires every Local Planning Authority to prepare and keep up to date a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to ensure sufficient land is made available to deliver housing to meet future housing needs. The primary role of the SHLAA is to identify sites and broad locations with potential for development, assess the development potential and the likelihood of that development.*

Inclusion of a site within the SHLAA does not mean that it will be looked on favourably for planning permission. It is merely a site that has been assessed.

2.7 The application site is included within the latest SHLAA for 2021 (Ref site No 47) and the assessment considers that whilst the site is available, it is not considered achievable, deliverable, suitable or developable.

2.8 Policy SP 2 sets out a settlement hierarchy and a development strategy for the Borough. Barton is regarded as a Strategic Village with both a housing allocation and a windfall allowance. In both cases, however, any development is intended to be directed to sites within the village. Any development – even in this case – on the edge of the village outside the settlement boundary is regarded as being in the open countryside where restrictive planning policies apply. We see nothing in the applicant's accompanying documents to justify allowing development outside of the settlement boundary, especially as the site has already been assessed as unsuitable within ESBC's SHLAA. We, therefore, object to the proposal as being contrary to Policy SP 2.

Policy SP 8 Development outside settlement boundaries

3.1 Development outside the settlement boundary is governed by Policy SP 8. Development here will not be permitted unless it is for such things as being essential to support the viability of an existing local business, providing facilities for the local community, being necessary to secure a significant improvement in the landscape and being otherwise appropriate in the countryside. If any of these criteria are met, then there is another set of hoops to go through. These include issues such as development must not affect the amenities of existing residents, not introduce a considerable urban form and development being out of character with the surrounding area. Proximity to a settlement is a consideration but under this criterion any proposal should not create an unacceptable urban extension.

3.2 We cannot see that this proposal meets any of this first set of criteria. We would suggest that the landscape in this location is not degraded and so there can be no justification on those grounds. From our experience the limits to development have proved to be an effective delineation between the built form of the village and the open countryside. No land use justification is given for wanting to extend development on this eastern side of Dunstall Road. Residential use is not one which would fall into the category of being otherwise appropriate in the countryside.

3.3 If the first set has not been met then we assume that this second set of criteria does not come into play. The nature of development on Dunstall Road is one of large properties on substantial plots. Whilst the proposal is also a development on a large plot, we consider that the settlement boundary on both sides of the road provides such a definitive limit to development that the proposed site would provide an unacceptable and unwarranted extension of development into the open countryside. In that sense it would introduce and extend an urban form and would, therefore, affect the amenities enjoyed by existing land users and be incompatible with the character of the surrounding area. The open nature of the site immediately to the north of Barton Hall and the Deer House also means that the site relates to the open countryside beyond the village rather than inward looking to the built form of Barton.

3.4 It is a particular character of the built-up form of the village that there is an abrupt relationship between the edge of development and the open countryside. This is particularly the case along Main Street, where the historic form of the settlement was linear with hardly any development in depth. You only need to walk down Crowberry Lane past the Village Hall and the Methodist Chapel to experience that you are immediately in the open countryside looking towards Smiths Hills and Dunstall. It is, therefore, perhaps not surprising that the settlement boundary to the village is drawn very tightly at the end of the built form on both sides of Dunstall Road, immediately on the boundary to Barton Hall and the Deer House on the east and at the end of the frontage ribbon development on its western side. It is noted that the development on its

western side stops well short of the comparable boundary on the eastern side, so they are not co-aligned and we assume that this is intentional.

3.5 The Design and Access Statement (page 6) suggests that the site could be viewed as an infill site. We do not see how the proposal could be regarded as either infilling or rounding off. We understand that the term infilling is generally defined in planning terms as the infilling of a small gap in an otherwise built-up frontage. That is clearly not the case here. The site is too large for a small gap and the property along Small Meadow Lane is some distance away.

3.6 We can understand why the applicants might regard the proposal as “rounding off”, but the meadow on the frontage is not included as part of the proposal and the rounding off would be to what we would regard as an arbitrary one up to the lane. There is no physical connection between this proposal and the property on Small Meadow Lane. Small Meadow Lane, as a narrow rural lane, is part of the wider countryside character and so does not provide a defensible boundary. This is provided by that definitive and defensible hard boundary provided by the Deer House and Barton Hall.

3.7 We feel that the site provides an important gateway to the village emphasising this abrupt relationship between built form and the open countryside, and as such should remain undeveloped to protect the countryside location, the character of the area and the visual amenity of existing land uses. Indeed, the illustrative photographs showing a mock-up of how the proposal would sit in the landscape demonstrates the dominance and height of the buildings. The countryside beyond – albeit currently the sand and gravel workings !! – is clearly visible, emphasising, once again our concern about preserving its open character.

3.8 We cannot see how this proposal for residential development meets the criteria for allowing development in the countryside under the terms of policy SP 8 and we object accordingly.

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

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

4.2 The role of the National Planning Policy Framework July 2021 (NPPF) is important. Para 199 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm. It seems to us that the default position of the NPPF is to conserve the asset. Even if the harm is regarded as less than significant the public benefits of approval need to be demonstrated.

4.3 We also note from the applicant’s Heritage Statement that they have highlighted the Historic England’s advice. In particular, they refer to the issues surrounding the setting of heritage assets. They quote in their paragraph 2.26 that setting is a visual term with views considered to be an important consideration in any assessment of the contribution this makes to the significance of the assets.

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

4.5 *With that last issue in mind, it is noticeable that the Conservation Area Appraisal (page 23) includes a photograph, looking north-west, taken from what looks like the driveway into the Deer House. This photograph amply demonstrates the point we were making above that views here look towards the countryside rather than inwards to the village. Indeed, the nature of the Small Meadow Lane with its hedgerows contributes to this rural setting and scene.*

4.6 *According to the Appraisal, the eastern side of Dunstall Road is characterised as much by its green spaces as by its buildings. The properties are large and being built on spacious plots appear quite grand. The Appraisal notes that the character of this part of the Conservation Area is distinct. The larger plots with houses set back from the road provide a sense of wealth and importance. The Appraisal also notes that the space between properties is almost as important as the buildings themselves for defining the special interest of the area. We, therefore, consider that the application site does not relate to the village but to the open area beyond and see Small Meadow Lane as part of that rural scene.*

4.7 *The Appraisal also identifies both sides of the Dunstall Road frontage as providing important trees and green spaces. On its eastern side, this provides the setting for Barton Hall and includes the Deer House. Although the application site is not included in this designation, we believe that the Appraisal provides sufficient evidence to justify their open nature and subsequent retention and to resist development that might affect the special quality of this area. We also believe that the Appraisal supports our earlier expressed view about the relationship between built form and the countryside within Barton.*

4.8 *It seems to us that the application site has always been part of the wider countryside and almost parkland setting of Barton Hall. Changes may have taken place internally within the grounds but the role of the site in relation to the hall has remained unchanged and still performs that important countryside and parkland setting as emphasised in the Appraisal. So, we must disagree with the conclusion of the applicant's Heritage Statement that any impact will be less than substantial. We feel that the level of harm is significant because of the hard edge to the Conservation Area, which is part of the distinctive character of the village. We also fail to see how the proposal can enhance the heritage assets and their settings as required in the planning policies.*

4.9 *Para 6.16 of the Planning Statement pleads that the public benefits of having a self-build site outweighs the planning policy considerations. We feel that any public benefits of allowing a self-build plot are perhaps more personal than public and that they are of low significance – unlike the harm we feel developing the plot would do to the Conservation Area, the setting of the listed buildings and the surrounding landscape. We object to the proposal as being contrary to Policies SP 5 and DP 5.*

Policy SP 24 High Quality Design

5.1 *Policy SP 24 informs us that development proposals must contribute positively to the area in which they are located. They must help to create a sense of place, building on, in this case, rural character and respecting local patterns of development and the historic environment. Local distinctiveness is to be maintained by reinforcing character and identity.*

5.2 *The Applicant's design solution to the site is explained in the Design and Access Statement (page 12). The proposed dwelling is largely two storeys with a pitched roof incorporating elements of hip and gable ends to suit(sic) its natural geometry. Its form and scale reflect the agricultural character of the site and its proximity to the built settlement area of the village. This is emphasised in the contemporary approach of a functional aesthetic with the use of tonal characteristic brick and timber cladding.....".*

5.3 *Clearly, the applicants have given some considerable thought to the design, but we feel that the reason why a contemporary structure was proposed has not been explained. Page 1 of the Design Statement explains that the architecture has been inspired by the "...quintessential attractive historic properties in the village high street with the essence of the agricultural buildings in the Staffordshire locality ...". Try as we may, we just cannot see how the style and materials to be used here are reflective of Main Street properties or indeed local farm buildings. It might have helped the Parish Council to have understood the style references if photographs of those inspiring local buildings had been included.*

5.4 *ESBC's Design Guide (page 110) includes a section on Barton and concludes that, "The predominant building materials are red-orange brick, with some limited use of Staffordshire Blue Brick for detailing. Stone has mainly been used for detailing..... Light coloured painted brickwork and Plain red clay tiles were used predominantly for roofs along with Staffordshire Blue clay tiles and Blue Welsh Slate. Roofs are generally steeply pitched and simply designed ending in gables...." (para. 4.47). The Design Guide then goes on to state that any new development should reflect these basic characteristics. Clearly, red brick is included in the design, and roofs are pitched, but we do not see where the timber cladding comes from. The proposal does not seem to match these other characteristics of the village as set out in the Design Guide, which as a Supplementary Planning document should be considered a material consideration and given some considerable weight accordingly.*

5.5 *As this is such an important open site on a gateway to the village and adjacent to the Conservation Area, we would like a second opinion in terms of the proposed design. We would therefore request ESBC to refer the application to the Design Review as allowed for under Policy SP 24.*

5.6 *In relation to ESBC's own Design Guide and particularly its plea for new development to follow the local character set out for the village then we cannot see how the proposal contributes positively to the area. It is too contemporary and, as we have seen above, upsets the open character of the area and the setting of the heritage assets. We do not feel that the proposal reinforces local character and identity and, as a consequence, does not contribute positively to the area. We, therefore, object to the proposal as being contrary to Policy SP 24 and to the ESBC's Design Guide.*

Self-build housing

6.1 *According to the Planning Statement a key plank of the Applicant's case is that the Local Plan is silent with regard to self-build housing. Accordingly, they conclude that the Local Plan is out of date and, therefore, this proposal should be approved.*

6.2 *As we understand it, from the Applicant's Planning Statement, the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 requires Local Planning Authorities to keep a register of those seeking plots for self-build housing. If our understanding of the Table in para 6.9 of the Planning Statement is correct, then from 2016 to May 2022 there were 87 entries on the Register and over the same period 89 permissions had been granted. Entries in the Register may vary of course as those who expressed a preference for self-build may over time find other opportunities. The information is also not up to date for information up to April 2023. But surely the Table demonstrates that ESBC has been giving permission for plots and so we are confused about how the Applicants can claim that somehow ESBC is not fulfilling its obligations. True, as far as we can detect, there is no reference to self-build housing in the Local Plan, although Policy SP 16 does refer to meeting a mix of housing needs. As a generic term, this may or may not include self-build housing. Although the Local Plan may not refer to self-build as such, the Housing Choice Supplementary Planning Document was approved as recently as March this year, following a period of consultation last Autumn. This document defines self-build housing and concludes (para 5.5) that ESBC encourages self-build plots but recognises that they need to be in line with policies in the Local Plan.*

6.3 *Our interpretation of what the Local Planning Authority has to achieve with regard to self-build housing is that they need to provide planning permissions to meet a recorded need within a three-year period. Over the last few years, they appear to be meeting this objective. There may be a gap regarding current data but surely this should not invalidate the Local Plan?*

6.4 *The Applicants refer to the general principle set out in para.11 of the NPPF which states a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Applications are to be determined in accordance with the development plan except where the plan may be out of date. In these circumstances there needs to be a clear reason for refusal, or any adverse impacts can demonstrably outweigh the benefits.*

6.5 *The application site falls within the open countryside. We hope that our analysis, as set out above, demonstrates that the effect of allowing development here is significant in view of its impact on the landscape where views look outward away from the village. We, therefore, feel that significant harm would be caused to the area and that the proposed design only compounds the problem as it fails to reflect local character. As such we disagree with the Applicant's Planning Statement (para 6.16) that the harm would be at the lower end of the substantial spectrum. Any public benefits are not specified in the Planning Statement. Any such gains to our minds would be for the individual and not for the community. We do not, therefore, feel that the case for the proposal is compelling and certainly not strong enough to justify overriding established planning policy.*

6.6 *If ESBC is mindful to approve this proposal, then we assume that they would be accepting the applicant's case for self-build. If this is the case, and this is the only reason for approval, then we would request that it would not be unreasonable to impose a condition which prevents the sale of the property for an appropriate period of time after completion.*

P/2023/ 00793**Conversion and alterations to existing workshops to form 2 residential dwellings including rooflights to Dwelling A, and a single storey rear extension to the adjacent dwelling, Croft Side and an external staircase to the garage for Dwelling B, Unit 1, 3 Bell Lane**

The site is located to the rear of the car park of the Middle Bell Public House on Main Street, although access is gained from off the adjacent Bell Lane. This access to the site, however, also provides a means of access to a rear car parking area for properties in the converted former Co-op store fronting Main Street. The application site was the former premises of Country Services, a servicing, repairs and sales location for mowing and agricultural machinery. The site consists of two parallel blocks linked by a covered underpass. One block is linked with Croft Side a residential property fronting Bell Lane and the other block is located immediately to the rear of the pub car park.

The proposal is to convert the two blocks into 2 residential properties. Adjacent off-street parking is provided as well as a small garden area for each property. According to the Heritage Statement the applicant owns the adjoining Croft Side, and this application also includes a single rear extension to this property. In addition, a portion of the garden for Croft Side is sub-divided to provide a garden and amenity space for this southern block.

The site lies within the Conservation Area and what the applicants refer to as Heritage Impact statement has been produced accordingly. Interestingly, however, this document states that it should be read in conjunction with a Design and Access Statement but there is no reference to this document being available on the ESBC website.

The site was the subject of a previous planning application also for the conversion into two dwellings (P/2019/01494). This was refused by ESBC on the grounds that it would result in an inadequate amenity space to serve the two properties and that it was positioned in such a way as to have an adverse impact on the amenity of future occupiers. The decision was appealed by the applicants and the Planning Inspector agreed with ESBC on the grounds that the proposal did not provide suitable space for future occupiers. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

Parish Council Comments**National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) July 2021**

1.1 The Parish Council objected to the previous planning application on the grounds of the need to retain premises for existing local services and facilities, and heritage and design considerations.

1.2 In that previous application we were particularly concerned about the loss of a building providing a local service. At the time we could not see how Barton could pursue its role as both a Strategic Village and a Rural Centre which aimed to protect local services and facilities if residential use was allowed in this central location. The consequence of such decisions would mean that local people sought out services and facilities in nearby towns, using private cars and thus negating the sustainable objectives of these policies.

1.3 The NPPF states that the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It then goes on to say that achieving sustainable development means that the planning system

has three overarching objectives which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways:-

- **An economic objective** – *to help build a strong responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places at the right time to support growth;*

1.4 *Para. 84 of the NPPF asserts that planning policies should enable the growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas. Most importantly for this application (para (d)), it should enable “.....the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship”.*

1.5 *The former Country Services workshop is located immediately behind the Middle Bell. Whilst not having a Main Street frontage it does have easily available access from off Bell Lane. In small rural centres it is not uncommon to have such commercial premises or service facilities immediately behind the frontage shops. Such locations can often provide an attractive courtyard area, ensuring that these areas form part of the commercial offer for the community.*

- **A social objective** – *to support strong vibrant and healthy communities by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of houses can be provided to meet the needs of the present and future generations; and by fostering a well designed, beautiful and safe places with accessible servicesthatsupport communities health, social and cultural well-being;*

1.6 *Para. 92 of the NPPF talks about planning policies and decisions needing to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places. This can be achieved, it states, through such things as promoting social interaction through mixed-use developments, strong neighbourhood centres and active street frontages.*

1.7 *Similarly, para. 93 talks about planning policies and decisions needing to provide social, recreational and cultural facilities by planning positively for community facilities such as local facilities and services to enhance the sustainability of communities and their residential environments.*

1.8 *It seems to the Parish Council that the NPPF suggests that retaining existing local facilities and services forms part of a healthy and safe community through enabling social interaction and helping to promote sustainable neighbourhoods, so avoiding the need to travel. The logic would appear to be, that the more services and commercial premises there are, the stronger the centre becomes.*

- **An environmental objective** – *to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.*

1.9 *This aspect of sustainable development is focused on preserving the built and natural environment. In this case, the site is located in the conservation area, and we would, therefore, wish to see a scheme that preserved protected and enhanced the conservation area.*

1.10 *How do we assess this application against these objectives? Clearly the retention of a service facility, with, presumably, the potential implication of job creation, supports the economic role. By increasing the net housing supply albeit by only two houses there is implicit support for this social role. But this social role also refers to supporting strong and vibrant communities and this surely means more than just providing houses. The most sustainable location for accessible services will be in the heart of the commercial area along Main Street. The environmental objective is, probably, neutral in this assessment provided no harm is done to the Conservation Area.*

1.11 *On balance, it is the Parish Council's interpretation that the retention of business/commercial use, with the potential to create jobs would seem to better promote sustainable development and benefit the local community than the conversion to residential development. As such we feel that the proposal is contrary to the general spirit of the NPPF.*

Strategic Villages/Rural Centres

2.1 *Barton is regarded as a "Tier 1" village where the main strategy is to direct development to sites within the settlement boundary. The site is located in the heart of the village and, therefore, the principle of development will be accepted. The site, however, lies within the Conservation Area and Barton is also identified in the Local Plan as a Rural Centre, and these issues are the subject of separate planning policies.*

2.2 *Tier 1 or 'Strategic Villages' are defined in the Local Plan (para 2.21) as, "meeting rural needs by providing a good range of services and facilities to their own populations and a wider rural catchment". Para. 2.22 further elaborates by stating that strategic villages will accommodate a strategic housing allocation which is intended to meet need generated in the village, its rural hinterland and also to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. The Borough Council, therefore, feels that this level of development will support existing services whilst enhancing its overall sustainability.*

2.3 *From this definition it would appear as though Strategic Villages are intended not just to meet their own needs but also to act as a kind of focus for the surrounding smaller rural villages. In this sense they promote sustainability by reducing the need to travel to larger centres.*

2.4 *Barton is also identified in Policy SP 20 as a Rural Centre which is defined as "Centres of varying size offering a basic level of shopping and service function for the village and immediate rural hinterland. These facilities will be protected.....". Whilst the former Country Services business certainly had an element of retail sales it provided more of a local service to the village and the surrounding rural hinterland. Changes to the Use Classes Order mean that whatever use it had would probably fall into a generic commercial/service Use Class E. This Use Class covers a wide range of uses including retail, financial and professional services, offices and industrial processes.*

2.5 *Local Plan policies have not kept pace with these changes, so it is a moot point as to how its retail and community facilities policies will now be interpreted. A former A1 use does not exist on its own but now falls into this general Use Class E. We must assume, therefore, that if ESBC wish to continue to use this policy to protect local services then, logically, it can only be applied to all uses within Use Class E.*

2.6 *Policy SP 21 is supportive of new development in Rural Centres if they are proportionate to the size of the centre, they lead to sustainable development and do not undermine the role of the centre. This policy also aims to prevent the loss of retail provision, "Development leading to the loss of uses within Class A of the Use Classes Order will only be permitted if:- the facility has been sufficiently and realistically marketed for over a six month period; that the current use is demonstrably no longer viable; and the change of use would not harm the vitality and viability of the local centre".*

2.7 *Barton, as a Rural Centre, is defined by a green diamond on the Proposals Map - on Main Street more or less with Crowberry Lane to the north and Bell Lane to the south - and so relates to an undefined area rather than specific streets. The main commercial heart of Barton plays an important role in the shopping hierarchy by providing for local essential needs. The aim of this shopping policy is to protect the Rural Centre, and there is also a facility to assess the loss of such retail/commercial uses. It is also clear that the retail role*

of Rural Centres go hand in hand with the overall development strategy. In a sense one is dependent on the other, as more housing helps support local services. If sustainable development is to be achieved – the viability and vitality of Rural Centres and consequently Strategic Villages need to be maintained by the protection of local services and facilities.

2.8 But with its proximity to Burton, and with a population of approximately 4500 you might expect to see rather more shops and services along Main Street. Like other villages of a similar size, Barton has undoubtedly lost a number of retail and other facilities over the years but there is still a strong commercial presence on Main Street. The south side of Main Street, from Wales Lane to more or less St James' Church has a continuous frontage of retail and commercial premises with only one or two exceptions. The Parish Council very much regrets, in particular, the loss of the former Co-op Store which introduced an element of "dead frontage" and took away a commercial opportunity for the village. We fail to see how the loss of yet another commercial facility can support the role of Barton as both a Rural Centre and a Strategic Village.

2.9 The Local Plan also contains Policy SP 22 Supporting Communities Locally. This indicates that community facilities act as the focus of community activity and contribute to community cohesion. Such community facilities are not comprehensively defined but they do include uses such as shops, banks and small-scale health facilities, all of which now seem to fall into use Class E. The policy also resists the loss of existing facilities and accordingly the Borough Council requires proposals to demonstrate that a particular service or facility is no longer viable and to explain what options have been investigated to maintain the facility or service.

2.10 It will be for ESBC to decide if the marketing aspect of Policies SP 21 or SP 22 applies in this case, but, whether it does or not, it is clear that the aim of both policies is to protect the vitality and viability of our rural centre and not to lose unnecessarily commercial opportunities which can support a vibrant, healthy and sustainable community in accordance with the aims of the NPPF. We cannot see how allowing a residential use in this location protects the viability of this rural centre and maintains the role of Barton as a Strategic Village. We object to the proposal as being contrary to Policies SP 20, 21 and 22, and essentially undermining the role of Barton as a Strategic Village and consequently sustainable development.

Heritage and Design Issues

3.1 The site lies within the Conservation Area and although the two blocks are not listed The Middle Bell PH is. The Conservation Area Appraisal (page 22) notes that for properties along Bell Lane, although they have been altered, they have retained their original features such as timber doors and boarding.

3.2 Para 197 of the NPPF states that in determining planning applications in relation to heritage assets, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of those assets. They should also take account of the positive contribution heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including economic vitality, and look at the desirability of new development making a contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

3.3 Para 199 amplifies the issue regarding the significance of heritage assets. It indicates that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and this is irrespective of whether any harm amounts to potential harm, less than substantial or substantial harm. You therefore get the impression that the default position is for conservation, and this appears to be the case even where harm is less than substantial. Here any harm has to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The Parish Council feels that the public benefits of retaining a service facility is greater than that of allowing a residential use.

3.4 Policies SP 25 and DP 5 say generally similar things about the need to protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings. As far as Conservation Areas are concerned development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it would protect and enhance the character and appearance including its setting.

3.5 Policy SP 24 is a key Local Plan policy to promote high quality design. To achieve this, proposals must contribute positively to the area in which they are located, and amongst other things respect local patterns of development and reinforce character and identity. From the way this policy is worded, it is clear that contributing positively is an imperative and, therefore, the implication is that if they do not meet this objective they should be resisted.

3.6 Policy DP 1, regarding design, notes again the need for new development to respond positively to its context. In particular, proposals need to take account of circulation routes, how they respond to the historic environment, open spaces, amenity and parking areas.

3.7 We appreciate that the Applicants have gone into some detail in assessing the quality of the buildings and it looks like many features are to be retained. Comparing the existing with the proposed elevations, however, there appear to be many more openings created to provide windows and patio doors, and as a result, the 'workshop' style seems to have been sacrificed for a more domestic feel. In particular, the single storey extension to Croft Side looks out of keeping with the character of this property. We acknowledge the pitched roof, but it has the look and feel of a modern extension rather than being integrated in a positive way to what we assume is a Victorian villa.

3.8 The Parish Council is concerned that the parking areas are not sufficiently integrated into the design of the development. A tapered courtyard area intrudes into the road providing access to not just this development but also the former Co-op building. We appreciate that this courtyard provides some amenity space for this block, but we are concerned that this is achieved at the expense of both the access road and the amenity of future occupiers of these properties. Pedestrian access to this courtyard and to the dwelling also appears to come directly from this narrowed access road. The narrowing of the access in this way is also compounded by the provision of two parking spaces in parallel also intruding into this access road. With this arrangement there would inevitably be a temptation for loading and unloading to take place by this opening and so blocking the access road rather than using the allocated parking area which is situated on the eastern boundary. We also question whether there is sufficient space to allow full access for emergency vehicles.

3.9 We feel that the objections regarding amenity space for the earlier application and Appeal have not been fully addressed to the point of this proposal not being able to provide an adequate living space and environment. We just feel it is difficult to insert two dwellings into this area without detriment to both the amenity of the occupiers and the access road. We, therefore, object to the proposal as being contrary to Policy DP 1

3.10 The Parish Council is not convinced that the proposal protects, conserves or enhances the Conservation Area or that it contributes positively to the area in which it is located. We, therefore, object to the proposal as being contrary to Policies SP 25 and DP 5.

3.11 We do not feel that the best or optimal design has been achieved and that it reflects the sense of place and local distinctiveness and accordingly calls on the Borough Council for a second opinion, through the use of a design review panel, as allowed by Policy SP 24. Accordingly, we object to the proposal as not contributing positively to its surroundings and, therefore, is contrary to Policy SP 24.

Minutes of **Barton under Needwood Parish Council Allotments Committee** Meeting which was held on Thursday 31st August 2023 at 10:00am, Small Meeting Room, Barton Village Hall, Crowberry Lane, Barton under Needwood.



Present:- Councillor Derek Lord, Councillor James Brookes, Graham Hughes Lettings Officer.

Absent:- Councillor Steve Harley.

- Meeting start was delayed until 10:15am, to allow members to arrive.
- It was identified that as we do not have a Terms of Reference under Standing Order 4d(i), we did not therefore have the number required for a quorum under a Terms of Reference.
- Furthermore, a minimum number for a quorum is no less than 3 under Standing Order 4d(viii). As there were only 2 Councillors present, meeting inquorate so was therefore closed.
- Meeting closed 10:22am.

James Brookes

Member of the Allotments Committee, Barton Under Needwood Parish Council

Informal Meeting about Allotments Notes

Present:- Derek Lord, James Brookes, Graham Hughes.

Informal meeting commenced 10:23am 31st August 2023.

As this was an informal meeting, no official decisions were made. Any official decisions will be made later either by the full Parish Council or by an official meeting of the Allotments Committee.

We took the opportunity to have a chat about matters at the Allotments for informational purposes only.

There was discussion about the Parking Area. So far there is only one quote that we are aware of, but there may be more or more attempts to get quotes. It will be for the full PC to debate/decide on whether this is sufficient and whether or not it accepts the quote(s).

There was a discussion about Bees. The previous PC implemented a no bees position on the Allotments. There was concern about Health & Safety for other nearby plot holders and that the standard procedure is the next plot available would be given to whomever was at the top of the list. This could mean that the person wanting bees could be given a plot near houses/in the middle of other plots with families and children either side. Whilst there is one small area in the top right corner of the Allotments, there were concerns that the neighbouring plot holders may not be in favour of bees there. It could also risk setting a precedent should more plot holders want bees. Additionally, it was mentioned that if they were honey bees, the amount of honey produced may exceed what is likely to be reasonably used within the policy about use of produce.

There had previously been an issue of stealing of fruit, but it was believed this was a rare occurrence and the specific incident had already been dealt with.

There was a discussion about the gate being left open, regarding unauthorised access. The view was that generally the last person out closes the gate. Closing the gate with people still onsite could be a problem, regarding people struggling to open it from the inside.

There was mention of people leaving taps on and that the view was Allotment holders are somewhat self-regulating on such matters.

There was mention of the Noticeboard near the entrance and that it's rotten and barely standing.

There was mention of some plot holders being in violation of the tenancy agreement. GH will put plot numbers in an email for the full PC to make a decision on at the next meeting.

There was discussion of SCC owning the land of the allotments and that the PC leases it. It was believed that the current agreement runs until 2024, so the Allotments Committee/PC may wish to look into this at some stage.

There was discussion about the proposed car parking area and whether this may be viewed as temporary, given that SCC owns the land.

There was discussion of whether or not people may be interested in having half rather than full plots. There would potentially be some practical issues on some plots with locations of sheds/greenhouses but not others. This is something which the Allotments Committee/full PC could consider asking about, if their view is that it's worth exploring.

There was discussion of the current prices for Allotments and whether they may increase if SCC rent increases. This would be for the Allotments Committee/full PC to take a view on though.

There is a small group of experienced people at the Allotments, who go around checking how things are being run on the ground. The Parish Council (potentially delegated to the Allotments Committee, as predicated on ToR) is responsible for the Allotments' governance though.

Informal meeting closed 11:23am.

VEC MEETING. 24 AUGUST 2023 @ 11am.

Present: Jeannette Taylor. Kevin Mcinerney, Ed Sharkey.

Apologies: Lindy Young. Charley Walker.

We discussed Remembrance Weekend, and the possibility that we would have to cover :
Friday 10th/Saturday 11th, alongside the main day, Sunday 12th November.

Jeannette to contact TRJS and TRIS. To see if they will be laying a posy on the Friday?

Kevin to contact JTHS, to see if they will be laying a wreath on either Friday or Saturday dates, as above.

Also, to check on the use of their Car Park, on the 12th of November?

Friday 10th of November: this will just be the RBL, the Vicar & Schools. Jeannette will attend this, along with any other VEC member.

Saturday 11th of November: Armistice Day - This will be RBL, Vicar, along with usually, some villagers, also the members of VEC.

This takes place on the Square itself.

We will need three Marshalls in attendance, to stop the traffic for the 2 minutes Silence.

We already have Jeannette & Kevin, but require another.

Sunday 12th of November: We will need Marshalls to man all the Road Closure points.

Responsibilities:

The Parish Council will be responsible for: Parade meeting up in the JTHS car park. The actual March, and the Marshalling of the roads, whilst the march is taking place.

Kevin will get all the Public Liability Insurance sorted.

RBL: The RBL will be handed back the responsibility for Organization of The Wreaths, and the Laying of the wreaths. The Sound system, and liaising with the Vicar. Also the Trumpeter. They will also be in charge of rehearsals for Standard Bearers on the Friday night.

We will be holding meetings in September and October with RBL, Marshalls and the Vicar. These dates, TBA.

The Chair of the Parish Council, asked about having a big function in 2024. It was agreed to discuss this at a later date; as we were not a full committee.

The meeting then closed.

Jeannette Chair VEC

Barton under Needwood Parish Council	
	Clerk to the Council / Responsible Financial Officer: Siobhan Rumsby Parish Council Office Village Hall Crowberry Lane Barton-under-Needwood Burton upon Trent DE13 8AF 01283 716059 clerk@bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk www.bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk
Village Enhancement Committee Terms of Reference Updated July 2023	

Introduction

This Terms of Reference sets out the purpose of the Village Enhancement Committee and how it will operate

Purpose of Committee

To facilitate and where necessary, run events which enhance the lives of the parishioners and contribute to their sense of community.

To explore opportunities that improve the welfare of parishioners and to work in collaboration with other organisations, charities or groups.

Membership

The committee shall consist of up to five Councillors

Frequency of Meetings

The committee shall meet as often as required. A quorum of each meeting shall be three members

Record of Meetings

The committee shall ensure that an agreed written record of each of their meetings is forwarded to all Councillors for acceptance at the next full Council meeting.

Attendance

It is expected, that where possible, that all members of the committee should attend all meetings.

CHAIRMAN: The Chairman of the committee shall be decided at the first meeting of the committee in each new financial year by a simple majority

EXTERNAL ATTENDEES: As required

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Committee meetings are open to the public

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

CORRESPONDENCE

GENERAL

1. Resident request to consider pedestrian crossing or traffic calming at junction of Short Lane with Wales Lane by jitty – *Clerk directed to County Cllr.*
2. Resident query (blue badge holder) regarding bollards on double yellow lines on Main Street opposite Co-op – *Advice obtained from County Liaison officer and illegal bollards have been removed.*
3. Copy resident email thread with police and ESBC Cllrs re need for CCTV at Oak Road Play area.
4. Resident report of Potters Way planting becoming overtaken with weeds and wild flowers. *Clerk responded*
5. Resident (Sutton Cres) noise concerns re motorcross track – *Clerk responded*
6. Resident queries about state of jitty Oak Road to Captains Lane – *Clerk referred to lengthsman*

SCC/HIGHWAYS

7. Cllr Jessel: reports and communications circulated.
8. Local Government Boundary Commission – Consultation to 16/10/23
9. Climate Action Fund details circulated

ESBC

10. Report of dead pigeon on footpath Collinson to Short Lane – *Clerk arranged for removal*
11. Notification of replanting of trees in Queen's Copse in November along with autumn wildflower seeds

POLICE

12. Notification of feedback regarding police reports, suggestion to collate information required via Staffordshire-pfcc.gov.uk and crime map at Staffordshire.police.uk. New PCSO Chris Edwards to join Needwood patch.

SPCA/NALC/SLCC

13. SPCA – Newsletters; Notice of AGM 30/10/23 – 7pm-9pm