

Receipts	Last Year 2024-25	Budget 2025-26	Actual to date	Year End Projection	Diff Proj v Budget	% variance	Comments
Total	138,149	40,051		40,051	0	0	
Local Authority Grant/Other	13,308	1,865		1,865	0	0.00	LA Grant
Burial Ground	16,000	16,000		16,000	0	0.00	
Allotments	1,668	1,925		1,925	0	0.00	Increase plot rent to £35
Fishing	2,500	2,500		2,500	0	0.00	
Interest	1,300	1,300		1,300	0	0.00	
Holland Sports Club Lease	478	450		450	0	0.00	Rent offset by HSC Insurance premium
Grants	100	0		0	0		Memorial donation Fishpond
VAT Reimbursement	10,997	5,500		5,500	0	0.00	Claim for Year 24-25
Car Park	10,391	10,511		10,511	0	0.00	CPI to May 25 = 2.8% on last year
Other		0		0	0		

Payments	Last Year 2024-25	Budget 2025-26	Actual to date	Year End Projection	Diff Proj v Budget	% variance	Comments
Total	136,234	117,052		117,052	0	0	
Staff costs	62,000	67,800		67,800	0	0.00	Based on 6.7% increase and includes uplift in Employer NI Contribution
Lengthsman	3,000	3,000		3,000	0	0.00	Living wage increase 6.7%
Admin / T&D/Professional	11,000	11,000		11,000	0	0.00	Subs, office supplies, hall hire, phone, postage, insurance, website, T&D, audit, legal
Donations & S137 payments	700	700		700	0	0.00	
Bank Charges	192	250		250	0	0.00	
Capital Expenditure	1,000	1,000		1,000	0	0.00	Equipment replacement contingency
Maintenance / Repairs)	3,328	3,000		3,000	0	0.00	
General	12,080	350		350	0	0.00	
Burial Ground	4,864	5,000		5,000	0	0.00	Memorial plaques increasing in number
Parks & Open Spaces	13,500	9,500		9,500	0	0.00	allowing for 8,500 ground maintenance, 180 CCTV; £800 seasonal planting
Fishpond	12,845	2,500		2,500	0	0.00	In line with expected income
Allotments	2,200	2,152		2,152	0	0.00	Committee budget received
Car Park	1,725	1,800		1,800	0	0.00	Includes Electricity for C.P. Lighting
Village Enhancement	2,500	3,500		3,500	0	0.00	Including provision for VE Day (band cost & Medics £1850)
Other Projects	0	0		0	0		
VAT	5,300	5,500		5,500	0	0.00	

Precept 2025-2026	82,292	Bank Balances as at:	02-Jan-25	Earmarked Future Provision 2025-26	
Less Projected Payments	117,052	Lloyds Current A/C	2,000.00	Ring-fenced Reserves	
Draw on Reserves	-34,760	Lloyds Deposit A/C	52,267.31	Car Park Maintenance & Resurface	£35,000
		Unity Trust	80,648.57	Full Brook Clearance funds (SCC)	£427
Projected Income	40,051	National Savings	34,494.67	Election expenses	£5,625
Projected Surplus/Deficit	5,291			Burial Ground Bench, fence memorial garden	£2,250
				Land Drainage Collinson Park	£19,652
Working Capital	134,916	Less unrepresented cheques	-	Fishpond Noticeboards	£1,200
General Reserve	34,495	Plus credits outstanding	-	Fishpond protection (island)	£3,300
Ring-fenced Reserves	67,454	Total	169,410.55		
Minimum Reserve	37,000			Total	£67,454
Net Funds	64,957				

PRECEPT CALCULATION

Net Expenditure less Grant from ESBC = Precept divided by Taxbase = Average Band D Parish Tax Rate

	Expenditure	Estimated Grant	Precept	Taxbase	Parish Rate	Increase
2025/2026	84157.25	1865	82292.25	1999.6	41.15	0%
2024/2025	83309.47	1865	81444.47	1979	41.15	

**Barton under Needwood Parish Council -
Schedule of Payments presented to Full Council**

09/01/2025

Payee	Description	£ Value Gross	£ VAT	£ NET	Allocation
Salaries total		4,167.14		4,167.14	HR
Nest Pension Scheme		193.78		193.78	HR
HMRC		1,043.56		1,043.56	HR
Barton Village Hall	ad hoc meetings	21.00		21.00	Admin
Barton Village Hall	Jan Feb March Office and meeting rooms	687.75		687.75	Admin
Lloyds	Bank Charges			13.38	Admin
Sky mobile	mobile phone and CCTV data	29.00		29.00	Admin & P&OS
Hulls Environmental	Pest control	98.00		98.00	Fishpond
Amazon	First Aid Kit replenishments	14.09	2.35	11.74	VEC
	Diary	4.76	0.79	3.97	Admin
	Fairy lights	4.99	0.83	4.16	Admin
	Multi port docking station	38.64	6.44	32.20	Admin
A. Davies	Refuse sacks	5.97		5.97	P&OS
Country Services	oil for garden machinery	24.50	4.08	20.42	Maintenance
G. Hughes	Replacement lock	44.27		44.27	Allotments
Starboard Systems Ltd	Accounts subscription inv	67.20	11.20	56.00	Admin
Hydro International	Flood gauge payable on installation	3,354.00	559.00	2,795.00	Admin
Source for Business	Water supply to allotments	73.82	0.00	73.82	Allotments
Source for Business	Water - Burial Ground	119.18		119.18	B. Ground
St James PCC	Electricity for star	50.00		50.00	VEC
NSKD Shoulder of Mutton	Electricity for christmas tree	100.00		100.00	VEC
Burton Firefighters	Donation in lieu of help with star	50.00		50.00	Donations
JK Contracting	Tree work at Collinson Park	588.00	98.00	490.00	P&OS
British Telecom	Landline and broadband Qtr	215.82	35.97	179.85	Admin
		10,290.19			

Highlighted items already paid are contracted, urgent or authorised from committee budgets for ratification

Other notifications:

Unity Interest Rate change

We're reducing your interest rate

Dear Mrs Rumsby

We wanted to let you know that the interest rate on your Instant Access Saving account is changing. This will come into effect on the 18/02/25. Please see your new interest rates below.

Your new interest rate

Account type	Existing rate Gross rate*/AER**	New rate from 18.02.25 Gross rate*/AER**
Instant access		
All balances	2.60% / 2.63%	2.50% / 2.52%

If you are happy with the change, you do not need to take any action and we'd like to thank you for continuing to save with us.

If you don't wish to accept these changes and would prefer to close your account(s) before the rate changes you can do this by completing the [account closure form](#) on our website or calling us on the number below.

If you would like any further information about these changes, please visit [unity.co.uk](https://www.unity.co.uk) or call us on 0345 140 1000^A.

Together, we have a bank to be proud of.

Yours sincerely

Anna de Rosier

Chief Operating Officer

Unity Trust Bank plc

For Businesses. For Communities. **For Good.**

Water Plus:

Notification of refund of charges £210.57

Barton under Needwood Parish Council - Receipts and Payments Monthly Summary

2024-2025

Receipts	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Rents	1,200.00	445.00	0.00	22.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,667.50		
Interest	77.93	106.87	117.60	92.26	40.63	272.70	49.71	67.82	57.67	403.45	0.00	0.00	1,286.64		
ESBC	40,722.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,722.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	81,444.47		
LA Other	932.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,375.93	0.00	500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13,808.43		
Burial Ground	1,185.00	1,815.00	3,440.00	1,820.00	2,160.00	300.00	785.00	300.00	830.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,635.00	16,000	-3,365
Fishpond	180.00	488.00	530.00	302.00	225.00	218.00	0.00	215.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,158.00	3,100	-942
VAT	0.00	0.00	10,997.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,997.49		
Car Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,390.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,390.96		
Other	0.00	0.00	150.00	40,158.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80,308.44		
Grants/donations	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00		
Total Income	44,297.67	2,904.87	15,235.09	42,395.20	2,425.63	53,888.86	11,275.67	41,082.82	887.67	403.45	0.00	0.00	214,796.93		

Payments	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Bank Charges	7.00	20.86	0.00	27.55	29.29	0.00	13.38	13.98	7.85	12.57	0.00	0.00	132.48		
Salaries	3,427.92	3,801.89	3,475.50	3,475.30	3,786.59	3,475.70	3,786.39	3,785.49	3,739.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	32,754.60		
Lengthsmen	206.00	257.40	206.00	205.80	257.40	206.00	257.40	205.80	296.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,097.80		
HMRC	1,314.12	934.79	1,068.56	883.88	884.28	1,068.56	883.68	1,068.73	1,080.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,187.26		
Nest Pensions	196.00	329.70	0.00	329.70	0.00	329.70	0.00	164.85	407.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,757.48		
Admin	1,019.94	2,587.48	1,205.00	957.93	319.58	309.85	2,843.48	204.66	386.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,834.90		
Burial Ground	204.17	231.59	164.56	1,338.01	162.50	20.03	508.71	20.01	182.50	119.18	0.00	0.00	2,951.26	2,385.00	-566.26
Allotments	0.00	0.00	0.00	81.06	26.19	0.00	524.98	44.27	0.00	73.51	0.00	0.00	750.01	2,200.00	1,449.99
Fishpond	98.00	9,792.00	180.67	0.00	0.00	357.12	264.93	302.41	168.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	11,163.43	12,845.00	1,681.57
Donations	75.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	120.00	0.00	478.40	100.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	823.40		
P&OS	80.00	1,711.71	2,948.43	1,938.54	1,158.54	20.67	1,462.34	20.97	10,015.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19,356.20	23,181.00	3,824.80
Capital Exp	533.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	533.00		
Maintenance	665.78	146.80	15.00	67.45	39.99	0.00	20.42	1,103.17	20.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,079.03		
Car Park	91.52	114.40	91.52	91.52	114.40	1,107.66	114.40	91.52	91.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,908.46		
General payments	0.00	636.69	11,443.44	40,001.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	23.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	92,105.12		
Projects	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	727.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	727.00		
VEC	228.36	218.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	420.00	149.14	41.74	200.00	0.00	0.00	1,257.66	2,500.00	1,242.34
VAT	291.38	2,132.21	815.70	649.44	317.33	60.40	883.78	418.56	2,108.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,677.68		
Total Spend	8,438.19	22,915.94	21,614.38	50,047.18	7,216.09	6,955.69	12,462.29	48,420.56	18,571.19	455.26	0.00	0.00	197,096.77		

Barton under Needwood Parish Council**Bank Reconciliation as per statements at:**

02-Jan-25

Lloyds Business Account	£	2,000.00
Lloyds Commercial Instant Access Saver	£	52,267.31
Unity Trust Bank Instant Access Saver	£	80,648.57
National Savings	£	34,494.67

Total Bank Balances**£ 169,410.55**Add Credits not on Statement£0.00 **£ 169,410.55**Less unpresented payments:-£0.00 **£ 169,410.55****Opening Balances :-****Bank Statements as at 31st March 2023**

Lloyds Current A/C	£	1,965.00
Lloyds Deposit A/C	£	74,372.32
National Savings	£	74,494.67
Petty Cash	£	150.00

Parish Council -

Total £ 150,981.99

<i>Add Receipts to date</i>	£	215,275.33
<i>Less Expenditure to date</i>	£	196,846.77

Total Cash and Investments as at -

£ 169,410.55**Difference** -£ 0.00RFO, S. Rumsby

PLANNING_– All matters have been referred to the Planning Committee and their comments appear in italics below, the Committee meet fortnightly 5pm, in the small meeting room, Barton Village Hall. Please contact the clerk for dates should you wish to attend any Planning Meetings

1. P/2024/01084 - Rhosyn Farm, Scotch Hills Lane: Retention of use as an animal encounter experience
According to the accompanying statement, the proposal is to operate a small project of animal encounters for members of the public. The statement makes clear that this project has already been running during the summer and the applicants would like to continue this in the long term. From what we can gather, therefore, this is a retrospective planning application for a proposal that already exists.

The applicants state that due to reductions in farming grants and increases in costs they have been looking to diversify and as they put it, "to make ends meet". The experiences essentially involve feeding the cattle as well as grooming and cuddling them and it also aims to educate visitors about the running of a working farm. The Statement indicates that, in inclement weather, the experiences will still operate but in one of the livestock barns. No information is provided to indicate which one and where it is located.

The red outline on the location plan shows an inverted "L" shape on a long farm track, from off Scotch Hills Lane and the rectangular area of woodland named on the OS map as Sherholt Plantation. The red outline here draws a line approximately just over half of the southern part of this plantation area. The accompanying statement does not actually say in so many words, but we have deduced that the animal experience will take place within this plantation area. There is also an accompanying block plan which indicates the proposed 20 parking spaces and again these appear to be located off a private driveway within the plantation.

Parish Council Comments

On the face of it, this is a laudable project providing what sounds like a valuable experience both for adults and children alike. Despite a fairly detailed accompanying statement and justification for the proposal, there remains a lack of clarity about some issues. Are we correct in assuming that both the activity itself and the parking will operate within the plantation area? If so, then how will this operate in practice? Do animals wander freely within the woodland and how is the parking area separated from the animal experience? Because the plantation is heavily wooded, when you look on google earth it is difficult to see the exact location where this activity will take place and similarly the parking spaces cannot be identified. As this activity may also take place within one of the barns in inclement weather, we assume that whichever barn is used will also need to be identified as part of the planning application. The applicants state that the experience will take place throughout the year and, therefore, could operate in the barn, on a more permanent basis, for a majority of the winter period.

Policy SP 8 Development outside settlement boundaries

Development is not allowed in the open countryside unless it meets the criteria set out in this policy. Development will be acceptable if it is essential to the support the viability of an existing lawful business or by the creation of a new business appropriate in the countryside in terms of its operation, size and impact. Even if acceptable in principle, developments must not adversely affect the amenities of existing land users and occupiers of residential properties.

The applicants state that this is a diversification project they have established due to a cutback in grants and increased costs. Whilst we can have sympathy with the need to diversify, we are not certain if the applicants have provided enough evidence to meet the criteria of Policy SP 8 in terms of how this proposal is essential to the viability of their business. Surely the applicants claim of needing to make ends meet needs to be backed with more information to demonstrate how this proposal will support the business. The criterion of being essential implies that the business may fail without this additional income. This sense of need does not come across as such in the supporting statement.

It could of course be argued that this is a proposed new business – notwithstanding the fact that this may be ruled out as it is already in operation – and clearly a rural location would seem to be appropriate. But its impact still needs to be assessed.

One of our concerns, as highlighted by a recent contact from a local resident, is the impact of traffic on housing near the junction with Scotch Hills Lane. We assume that access to the Rhosyn Farm property is really intended primarily for agricultural traffic, and as such likely to be infrequent and spasmodic. This proposal, therefore, seems to intensify the use of this agricultural track, and consequently a private drive. Clearly, the proposed traffic generated by the proposal is not just more intense but also on a regular basis and on several occasions during the day. From the applicants' own description of the proposal, five to eight cars are likely to be arriving and departing for each session with a maximum of six sessions at peak times. And this traffic is likely to be there every day throughout the year, albeit on a less intense basis at off-peak times. In the light of this intensification, we are concerned that the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the residents and their peaceful enjoyment of the countryside

In the light of this policy, we have concerns with regards to the adequacy of the evidence provided to demonstrate that the proposal is essential to support the viability of the existing farm. In addition, we feel that there are valid concerns about the impact the proposal may have in terms of the increased generation of traffic along an agricultural access to the detriment of the amenities of local residents. We, therefore, feel that the proposal is contrary to Policy SP 8. We would also like to see some clarity regarding the issues identified above, as well as the location and use of one of the barns that will be used for this experience.

Policy SP 14 Rural Economy

This policy has a specific criterion dealing with farm diversification. This states that such proposals will be supported where they make a long-term contribution to sustaining the agricultural enterprise as a whole and where this is environmentally compatible. As with our comments for Policy SP 8, we do not believe that the applicants have provided enough evidence to demonstrate the essential nature of this proposal for the farm's long-term benefit. We have already expressed concern about the impact of the proposal on local residents and therefore feel that it may not be environmentally compatible. We therefore object to the proposal as being contrary to this policy.

Policy SP 15 Tourism, culture and leisure development

We assume, that in view of the traffic generation and the visitor numbers involved, then this proposal will also be classified as a tourism project. Indeed, the applicants have suggested that there may be knock-on effects for the local economy, although their accompanying statement only mentions anecdotal reports of what this might mean. This policy generally supports tourism projects where they support the local economy. Tourism in rural areas will also be supported where they make use of the natural environment in a sustainable manner.

Again, we do not consider that enough evidence has been provided to demonstrate how this proposal may be beneficial to the local economy as required by the policy. In addition, we do not feel that the applicants have shown how the proposal protects and conserves the natural environment. What impact will both the activity itself and the parking provision have on the woodland? We appreciate that the applicants clearly have the welfare of the animals at heart and appear passionate about this. We believe that there is not enough evidence to demonstrate what impact this proposal will have on the local economy. In the absence of any such information, we must object to the proposal as being contrary to this policy.

P/2024/01223 - 26 Hardy Close: Crown reduction of Ash tree by approximately 2-3 metres close to previous points of pruning (T4 of TPO 132)

The application contains no reason for this TPO protected tree to have any work done to it. The application form indicates the tree is not diseased or dangerous nor causing damage to any property.

We therefore object to this application

Copy resident objections noted.

2. P/2024/01211 - Land Adjacent To Burton Gateway, Lichfield Road, Branston, DE14 3EQ: Discharge of condition number 9 of planning permission P/2015/00012 relating to Outline planning application for up to 21,500 sq m of employment floorspace (comprising 17,200 sq m of Class B8 (Storage and Distribution) and 4,300 sq m of Class B2 (General Industrial) with ancillary offices together with associated car parking, servicing, landscaping, drainage works, earth works and other ancillary works, including details of means of access – *no comments*
3. P/2024/01101 - 20 Main Street: Repairs to west facing double doors/windows, demolition of garage and greenhouse/orangery to facilitate the erection of a single storey garage and sun room extension with canopy, installation of a new resin driveway

*20 Main Street, or 'Newark House', an early 19th century listed building of painted brickwork and stonework, is located immediately west of Gower House at the corner of Main Street and Dunstall Road. Both properties are imposing buildings on the north side of Main Street and in the central part of the Conservation Area, opposite the grade 11*listed St. James Church. The footprint of Newark House is an inverted L-shape, with what would normally be the top of the 'L' providing the front elevation for Main Street. The main body of the building provides the long length, with the shorter length, at 90 degrees, consisting of a double garage and a greenhouse. According to the Design, Access and Heritage Statement, the proposals will replace the existing garage and convert the existing greenhouse into additional living accommodation. In addition, repairs are necessary to the west facing glazed doors and the existing gravel driveway is to be replaced with resin. The proposals maintain the existing footprint of the building, with the exception of a covered canopy and supporting posts in front of the proposed sun room.*

Parish Council Comments

From the elevational drawings, the works to the garage and greenhouse appear to have been approached with some sensitivity. Whilst we have no objections in principle, we do have design concerns. There is perhaps some confusion, as the planning application description, on the website, implies that both the garage and the greenhouse are to be demolished, but the Heritage Statement states that the garage is to be replaced, and the greenhouse converted. Some clarity would be helpful.

Design Access and Heritage Statement

According to para 207 of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024, for proposals affecting heritage assets, applicants are required to describe the significance of any affected heritage assets. This Heritage Statement fails in this regard merely stating that the property is listed and mentions two other listed properties. No mention is made of the Conservation Area which is a heritage asset.

Policy DP 5 requires applicants to prepare a Statement of Significance which sets out how the proposal would potentially affect the significance of the asset. As there is no description of the significance of the heritage assets, we, therefore, have no idea as to how this proposal affects any significance. Any alterations/extensions should preserve and enhance the integrity and setting of the listed building. We accept that the applicants state that they feel the proposal would have no impact on surrounding properties, but this is not accompanied by any explanation. The Heritage Statement fails to meet the requirement of this policy.

We have commented previously on numerous Heritage Statements which do not meet the requirements of the NPPF or Local Plan policies. This is not nit picking. As consultees and lay people, we feel that we need as much information as possible in order to assess planning applications. This is particularly the case where, in this example, the proposals affect not just a major listed building but also the conservation area. We would like to know what factors the applicants took into account to preserve and enhance the integrity of the listed building, and their reasoning for these choices, so that we can understand how it meets Policy DP 5. Just saying that significant attention has been given to maintain the visual appearance of the property without any explanation does not help our understanding.

On page 4 under the section sub-headed "Setting", we were bemused as to why the applicants had decided there would be minimal impact on the surrounding residents of Wales Lane – which is some distance away.

Resin Driveway

No explanation or reasoning is provided for the proposal to replace the existing gravel with a resin driveway. We believe that gravel is a more appropriate material to better reflect the setting of this 200 year old property, so we wonder why the option of upgrading the gravel was not considered. Resin, we feel, is too contemporary, although we respect its practicality. In the absence of any justification, it is difficult to understand why this material was chosen. At the very least, we feel the applicants need to explain how this material preserves and enhances the listed building and its setting, in order to meet the terms of Policy DP 5.

We had always assumed that resin was non permeable and, therefore, not very sustainable. On undertaking further research, we found that resin bound can be porous, but resin bonded may not be. Here we come across an inconsistency in the documents accompanying the application. The Heritage Statement refers to a resin bonded driveway system (page 3 under the section headed The Scheme), but the Schedule of Works (Day 4) talks about a resin bound surface application. There also appears to be no information about the colour of the resin.

We assume that, to meet sustainability objectives, ESBC would require a porous surface and, therefore, the discrepancy about which type of resin driveway requires clarification.

Glazed doors and windows

The Heritage Statement makes no reference to the type of doors or window frames, but the document headed Material Finishes refers to, "powder coated aluminium frame to windows, glazed roof panels and decorative posts to canopy". Again, we have no explanation or rationale as to the choice of materials or its chosen colour, in this case grey. How can we assess the impact of this proposal on the integrity of the building, as required under Policy DP 5, if the rationale for the choice of the materials is not provided? We feel that wooden frames would be far more in keeping with a 19th century listed building, so we are surprised by the use of aluminium. From the elevational drawings for the sun room, we get the impression that the applicants are trying to retain the feel of the orangery in the conversion of the greenhouse. So here again, we are surprised that wood has not been specified.

Conclusion

The Heritage Statement is poor as it fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF and Policy DP 5. We are aware that other Local Planning Authorities refuse applications for an inadequate statement. It is bereft of any explanation or rationale for the proposals and, therefore, as a consultee this makes it difficult to understand why particular choices have been made. This is important because the property is a fine listed building in the heart of the village and the conservation area.

We feel that a resin driveway is an inappropriate material and that the more traditional gravel surface is to be preferred. If ESBC, however, is mindful to approve, we would hope that they will be able to ensure that the surface is porous and that the applicants have to submit an appropriate colour for approval.

Similarly, we feel that the more traditional material of wood should be preferred for the doors and fenestration, as opposed to the proposed aluminium, as this better reflects the character, importance and integrity of the listed building and the surrounding conservation area. We also feel that the colour grey may be too contemporary for this setting and out of keeping with nearby listed buildings.

In the light of the above analysis, we object to the proposal as being contrary to Policy DP 5 and SP 25 as we feel that it fails demonstrate how it preserves and enhances the integrity and setting of the listed building and the conservation area. In addition, it fails to demonstrate how it contributes positively to the area under Policy SP 24.

There is something odd about the documents associated with this planning application reference on the website. A document entitled "Sections" – although stamped with the P/2024/01101 reference number - seems to relate to a different proposal entirely and, interestingly, the drawings are dated 2019

4. P/2024/01093 - 20 Main Street: Listed Building application for repairs to west facing double doors/windows, demolition of garage and greenhouse/orangery to facilitate the erection of a single storey garage and sun room extension with canopy, installation of a new resin driveway
5. P/2024/01205 - 69 Arden Road: Erection of a single storey side extension – *no objections*
6. P/2024/01312 - Bank House, 85 Main Street: Felling of Ash tree (ash 1) due to die back
All members of the committee, being acquainted with the applicant, declared a non-pecuniary interest. With no objections to this proposal, if granted, we do ask that the decision notice contains an informative asking that the applicant consider planting a suitable replacement tree
7. EN010122 - Oaklands Solar Farm: Notification of completion of the Examining Authority's Examination; The findings and conclusions arising from the Examination, together with Recommendation will be sent to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero no later than 19 March 2025
8. P/2024/01259 - Church Farm Cottage, 5 Church Lane: Rear single storey and linked extension to the dwellinghouse to form new bedroom, shower / utility / boot room, dining / family room and large kitchen with associated roof lights and alterations to porch front elevation
9. P/2024/01238 - Holland Sports Club, Potters Way: Demolition of four existing single storey buildings to facilitate the erection of a replacement clubhouse

ESBC Decisions – Permissions Granted

10. P/2024/01073 - adj to 1 Meadow Rise: Repollard to previous pollard points to 1 Tilia x europaea (Lime tree) and crown reduction of 3m to 1 Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut tree) (TPO No 8)
11. P/2024/00689 - The Bur, Scotch Hills Lane, Barton Gate: Erection of an open storm porch to the rear and replacement windows
12. P/2024/01114 - The Lodge, Dunstall Road: Felling of 3 Cherry trees (T1-T3)
13. P/2024/01127 - 30 Mill Lane: Demolition of single storey side extension and conservatory to facilitate the erection of a two storey side extension, erection of single storey front and rear extensions and demolition of existing detached garage to facilitate the erection of a single storey detached outbuilding
14. P/2024/01003 - The Towers House, Dunstall Road: Erection of a single storey rear extension and alterations to the roof on the existing single storey rear element to facilitate the installation of a new door to the ground floor
15. P/2024/01067 - Forest Thorn Farmhouse , Scotch Hills Lane, Barton Gate: Erection of a detached double garage.
16. P/2024/01100 - 81 Wales Lane: Listed Building Consent to carry out repairs to include raking out old mortar, repointing including replacing spalled brickwork to main house and garden wall with new brickwork to top of garden wall
17. P/2024/01241 - Land South of, Lichfield Road, Phase 6, Branston: Non material amendment to reserved matters application P/2021/00399 for the erection of one B2 and B8 industrial building (Unit B173 - Phase 6). Amendments include: Provision of new 2m wide highway footpath, transformer and gas kiosk GRPs, outdoor amenity space location, maintenance access gate added to fence along new 2m footpath

ESBC Decisions - Refused

18. P/2024/01096 - Barn, Brankley Farm, Dunstall Cross: Prior Approval for the conversion of an agricultural building to form one dwelling.

Correspondence

To DC Support,

Re caravan at Rhosyn Farm, Scotch Hills, Barton Under Needwood.

Barton Parish Council recently emailed you with the attached letter concerning the application for "temporary" siting of a caravan P/2020/01336 which is as yet undetermined.

We are concerned as we are informed that the caravan is still present and indeed being occupied. This would appear to be contravening planning policy.

We ask if you have had the opportunity to look into this matter. We understand that should you wish to take any enforcement action there may be time limits to prevent a fait accompli.

Kind regards,

Ian Gilbey,

Chairman Planning Committee, Barton Under Needwood Parish Council

Response from ESBC

Good afternoon Ian

I refer to the concerns raised by the Parish Council regarding the caravan at Rhosyn Farm.

I am now the case officer dealing with the above application. I am aware that the family are living in the caravan and when I received the file in May this year I contacted the applicant to establish an update of the status of the caravan and farm. For information if the application had been granted consent for the three year period it would not necessary mean that once that period was up that the caravan would then have to be removed.

The current situation is that confidential documents have been received which updates the farming business along with financial information and is being independently assessed by a consultancy who specialise in these sort of applications. There are some issues that need to be resolved prior to the determination of the application and to ascertain whether the business is viable enough to warrant the retention of the temporary dwelling on site.

The initial application was submitted which requested it for a three year period whilst the new farm was being established, as the farm is now established consideration of the application is whether the farm is viable to warrant a further 3 years temporary consent.

The relevant policies for considering the application are:-

“Strategic Policy 8 which states

Development outside settlement boundaries will not be permitted unless it is:

- essential to the support and viability of an existing lawful business or the creation of a new business appropriate in the countryside in terms of type of operation, size and impact and supported by relevant justification for a rural location;”

“Strategic Policy 14 states

Where a new rural business enterprise, or expansion of an existing one, requires on- site residential accommodation the Council may grant permission for temporary residential accommodation only (e.g. a mobile home or caravan) or grant permission for premises to be used for residential purposes for a temporary period only in order to allow time to assess the viability of the business. When this has been demonstrated, permission will be considered for more permanent residential accommodation.”

The Planning Enforcement Officer is aware of the above and is monitoring the site.
Regards

Erica Buchanan
Principal Planner
Development Control
East Staffordshire Borough Council

CORRESPONDENCE

GENERAL

1. BVHMC – report of incident in car park by the Eurobin; double yellow lines suggested on exit path.
2. Resident reports and Right of Reply request from ITV Central on Effllinch Lane flooding – *response sent*
3. Resident report of drains flood/ice related issues on Bar Lane including wall damage, *Clerk referred to Cllr Jessel*
4. Resident report of speeding on The Green and requesting for traffic calming; *Clerk responded referring to County Councillor information on traffic survey carried out.*
5. Copy resident communication to Skippers with evidence of HGV traffic in village.
6. Copy resident communication to MP regarding improvements to cycle route/ canal towpath to Alrewas.
7. Copy EA letter to St Modwen's reminding them of their riparian ownership responsibilities for stretches of water adjacent their properties.

SCC/HIGHWAYS

1. Reminder regarding Land Registration of revised Allotments Lease

ESBC

1. Precept tax base calculation figures received.
2. Community & Civil Enforcement Team's focus on Bagots & Needwood w/c 13 Jan, *Clerk reported back some hotspot areas to visit.*

POLICE, FIRE & RESCUE SERVICES

1. Notification of change in personnel - replacement of CI Scott Gidman with CI Rob Neeson w/e/f 6/1/25

SPCA/NALC/SLCC

1. Consultation on strengthening standards and conduct regime
2. Newsletters and training opportunities- *forwarded to all Cllrs;*