



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

Barton Parish Council Report

Serious Acquisitive Crime

Reports of jobs for the Barton area between 01/07/2025 - 31/07/2025

Public Order = 1 report

Vehicle Crime = 1 report

The Public Order relates to an argument between neighbours which was reported by a third party.

The Vehicle Crime relates to a vehicle having its tyres slashed.

Anti – Social Behaviour

Reports from the 01/07/2025 - 31/07/2025 for **ASB** 3 reports.

All 3 reports of ASB relate to the same ongoing neighbour dispute.

Transport Related

Reports of jobs for the Barton area between 01/07/2025 - 31/07/2025

RTC (reportable) = 1 report

Transport Related = 5 reports

The RTC related to a hit and run incident.

The transport related incidents involve 2 reports of a speeding vehicle, 2 reports of a vehicle driving erratically, and 1 report of a parked vehicle.

Local Policing Team

PCSO Tim Leathers – timothy.leathers@staffordshire.police.uk

PCSO Dominka Siwek - dominika.siwek@staffordshire.police.uk

SMART ALERT

BE SMART AND KEEP UPDATED – GET FREE, LOCALISED CRIME ALERTS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY ADVICE BY UTILISING THE STAFFORDSHIRE SMART ALERT APP. THIS IS AVAILABLE FREE AND IS AVAILABLE FOR BOTH APPLE AND ANDROID DEVICES. YOU CAN ALSO GET EMAIL ALERTS THROUGH THE FOLLOWING WEBSITE;

WWW.STAFFORDSHIRESMARTALERT.UK/STAFFS//

July 2025 report
for Cllr Catherine Brown Needwood Forest Division

For Parish Councils and Borough Councillors,

It has been a very varied interesting month with lots of improvements. Several issues can't be resolved straightway due to their complexities, issues out of my control or if they have not reached the planning application stages, as an example.

Please do let me have your agendas and meeting dates.

Planned meetings in July 2025:

1. Barton PC War Memorial Bollards 4/8/25 onsite.
2. Yoxall PC 30mph/Hadley End gateways/future planning applications.
Bob Keys met Richard Rayson
3. S106 money Tatenhill/Rangemore planned 4/8/25 onsite.
4. Dave Robertson MP The Crown Abbots Bromley Sunday 29/6/25, FU 29/7/25.
5. Aviation lane play area meeting 4/8/25.

B5013 Steering Group.

Due to racing cars and motorbikes of the B5013 over 3 divisions, and 5 years of work, I have everyone's agreement (including neighbouring councillors) to set up a working party with the Deputy Police & Crime Commissioner, MP, 3 PCs, and 2 Highways Divisional leads for a meeting at Admaston in September.

Six-Lane Ends:

The data doesn't appear to reflect the accidents. [Please would all residents and PCs report all incidents small and large.](#)

I hope to set up a steering group in early 2026, when more data is available. I have been in touch with the other 2 County Councillors involved and asked them to relay the lack of data information to the neighbouring parish councils and encouraged to report crashes and incidents more fully.

Voluntary Neighbourhood Champions:

Setting this up was one of my 3 election issues. Due to the current volume of work across the division I am not able to commit much time to this, but I hope to in the New Year. I am hoping to find someone willing to do a comprehensive survey in the meantime across all parishes in our division.

Divisional Forum:

I currently have had no replies to my enquiry in the June report asking Parish Councils if they would like a Divisional Forum in the Autumn, as set up by ex-CLlr Julia Jessel. I do understand that this may not be required due to me attending PC and additional meetings.

Please would you like to let me know what you would like to do?

The Community Fund is still open and applications need to be discussed and agreed with me before the application process. I hope that during September this will be finalised to allow applications to be completed by November 2025. I hope to spread the £2500 across the 9 parishes in the Division.

Please may I have an opportunity to put some publicity on your websites and in newsletters please?

Meetings & visits attended:

Full Council including 3 questions to the council leader which is unusual for a new Counsellor; County Council Charities & Trust Overview & Scrutiny Committee; County Council Health & Care Overview & Scrutiny Committee; Dave Robertson MP x2; Chetwynd Bridge/A515 Steering Group organised by Peter Mason, Cabinet Lead for Highways; Yoxall Fete at St Peter's School; Barton Holland Park charity run finale; 23/6/25 Fire HQ with Ben Adams & Chief Fire Officer.

Training:

Charities & Trusts Overview and Scrutiny training; Mental Health in Schools training; Finance slides; Equality training.

Planning applications all discussed at length. RR has discussed with SCC Development Control: Bar Green, Barton; Lightwood Road & Hadley Street, Yoxall.

Home Farm, Dunstall Village PA for café, car park and retail units. One resident has been in touch many times, as they are concerned about the traffic and planning committee process.

Misc:

The old spreadsheet of highways issues is now out of date. The following are a brief list to allow all the parish councils sight of their own and other issues in the Division that are being discussed and/or dealt with.

Dunstall:

1. Resident concerned at the Home Farm planning application.
2. 30mph issue closed for now.

Barton:

1. War Memorial area bollards- replacement of damaged bollards to be discussed at a meeting with Richard Rayson. Meeting 4/8/25 with PC and Highways.
2. 'Rabbit' damaged sign at traffic calming at Barton Turn end will be replaced asap. On-going.
3. Removed bollards at Barton gate end will be left as it is. No further action. No replacement bollard as it keeps getting knocked over.
4. Main Street 30min parking bays to remain. Second sign re-instated. Allows for quick turn-over of business traffic but allows overnight and weekend parking for longer. Enforcement Officers have been out twice and the resident is continuing to ask for changes made by the PC. I think this needs to be reviewed to allow fairness to all and understand the justification.
5. Providence Planning Application discussed and reviewed. RR has discussed with SCC Development Controller ahead of the SCC highways report. I have been copied into emails from a number of residents contacting ESBC planning team.
6. Barr Green Action Group (BGAG)- culvert/drainage resolution/new grit bin. Await info regarding future issues after heavy rain. Several emails received as BGAG were expecting further bollards etc. but they are not suitable for the size of pavement. Highways said nothing further is required at present.
7. Efflinch Road flooding. Highways culvert under road broken- fixed. Highways says this has been fixed and landowner had been contacted regarding ditch emptying in the autumn after bird nesting season. BPC are asking for the details and specification for the work that has been done and continue to question it's validity.
8. Captain's Lane traffic. Highways to do the speed and volume survey. Previous speed volume survey 2 years ago did not show sufficient data for action. On-going.

Tatenhill & Rangemore:

1. S106 traffic calming. Meeting booked for 4/8/25
2. Gully emptying Main Street, Tatenhill. Not done -awaiting surveyor.
3. Rangemore Common horse road signs to be discussed by PC alone, not for SCC. Informed PC.

4. 4/8/25 meeting with Highways outside Rangemore School to discuss speed and traffic.

Hoar Cross:

1. Applying for CF for Defib.
2. Request to Highways to remove posts and signs from Thorney Lanes. Awaiting reply.
3. Footpath from HXH entrance to Church. Maintenance work is being planned before the autumn. On-going.
4. New Maker Lane sign -ESBC.

Yoxall:

1. Yoxall Fete: It was good to speak with the PC, church group, guides, RBL & residents on a very hot successful day.
2. A515 South 30mph signage and SIDs by new development. Developer to pay. Gateway signs agreed. Information from Bob Keys.
3. Ferrers Road curb and pavement replacement 30th June. Children tripping and falling over on their way to school. Cancelled a second time but following my contact with Highways this was fixed within 24 hrs.
4. Hadley End gateway signs- part of Bob Key's meeting with Highways.
5. Potential Lightwood Road housing development discussed at length with RR. RR did discuss with Development Control- no PA at present.

Abbots Bromley:

1. Rugeley Turn B5013/4. New signage- poorly placed and one damaged. Ongoing.
2. Road speeding/signage etc. B5013. On-going
I have organised a B5013 Steering Group meeting in September with David Evans Deputy Police & Crime Commissioner; Cllr Janet Higgins and Cllr Gary Hale's for the neighbouring divisions. " Highways teams; Colton PC, Blithfield PC & Abbots Bromley PC.
3. Highfields Abbots Bromley footpath. CB had contacted Naomi Perry, planning officer has not replied.
4. The Crown. Chairs and tables on Highways. Ongoing. See ABPC minutes and communications.
5. Ashbrook Lane/Burton Road after 30mph. Damaged curbs at the narrowest part. On-going.

6. B5013 hedge cut, and Yeathall Lane grass have been cut due to safety concerns.
7. New cemetery – on going. A number of discussions and emails.

Newborough:

1. The bollard at Abbots Bromley end traffic calming is urgently to be reviewed. Feedback required.
2. Thorney Lanes maintenance work scheduled for 4/7/25, cancelled. Urgent work to be done. Also long term plan for resurfacing in 2026/7.
3. Culvert fixed Marchington end of Thorney Lane. Done.
4. Six Lane Ends. As above.

Wychnor meeting:

Noticeboard project is complete.

Branston: Henhurst Hill/Shobnall Road/Rough Close

1. B5017 Wt restriction formal consultation
2. Aviation Lane play area. Meeting 4/8/25.

Please get in touch if there is anything not mentioned. Old resolved issues or those now not in our division are not mentioned.

Barton under Needwood Parish Council - Receipts and Payments Monthly Summary

2025-26

Receipts	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Rents	1,220.00	140.00	110.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,470.00		
Interest	20.48	23.87	25.10	23.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	92.83		
ESBC	41,146.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41,146.13		
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	2,235.00	185.00	3,060.00	1,950.00	270.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,700.00	16,000	-8,300
Fishpond	409.00	260.00	130.00	228.00	156.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,183.00	2,500	-1,317
VAT	0.00	0.00	11,143.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11,143.16		
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		
Other	116.80	0.00	92.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	208.98		
Grants/donations	50.00	8,322.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,372.08		
Total Income	46,129.91	8,930.95	14,560.44	2,201.38	426.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	72,248.68		

Payments	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Bank Charges	8.50	34.25	0.00	18.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	61.63		
Salaries	3,682.12	4,773.92	3,464.72	3,806.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15,727.43		
Lengthsmen	195.40	259.38	195.40	244.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	894.64		
HMRC	0.00	0.00	1,556.57	1,294.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,851.01		
Nest Pensions	183.28	0.00	183.28	183.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	549.84		
Admin	1,660.47	1,976.74	1,504.08	854.10	36.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,031.68		
Burial Ground	20.00	0.00	0.00	366.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	386.66	5,000.00	4,613.34
Allotments	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	2,152.00	2,152.00
Fishpond	425.24	0.00	297.28	394.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,116.86	2,500.00	1,383.14
Donations	0.00	157.50	25.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	222.50		
P&OS	13,370.37	405.97	2,398.45	1,479.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,654.58	24,213.00	6,558.42
Capital Exp	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		
Maintenance	0.00	32.21	69.21	60.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	162.26		
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		
General payments	360.00	2,690.08	0.00	19.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,069.38		
Projects	0.00	4,958.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,958.00		
Events & Comms	179.99	100.00	0.00	567.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	847.37	3,500.00	2,652.63
VAT	2,860.26	1,011.07	509.35	436.07	7.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,824.01		
Total Spend	22,945.63	16,399.12	10,203.34	9,766.21	43.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	59,357.85		

Barton under Needwood Parish Council -

Schedule of Payments presented to Full Council
(invoices and quotations emailed with meeting pack)

07/08/2025

		£	£	£	Allocation
Payee	Description	Value Gross	VAT	NET	
Salaries total		4,151.41		4,151.41	HR
Nest Pension Scheme		183.28		183.28	HR
HMRC		1,446.78		1,446.78	HR
Barton Village Hall	ad hoc meetings July	31.50		31.50	Admin
Lloyds	Bank Charges	18.75		18.75	Admin
Sky mobile	mobile phone and CCTV data	44.00		44.00	Admin & CA&E
JPS	Grounds maintenance July0132	1,413.42	235.57	1,177.85	CA&E
Country Services	Oil for gardening equipment	49.00	8.16	40.84	Maintenance
Vision ICT	Email account	12.00	2.00	10.00	Admin
Source for Business	Water Allotments	95.77		95.77	CA&E
Source for Business	Water Burial Ground	149.65		149.65	CA&E
Teddy Festival	Donation towards prizes	130.00		130.00	Donations
Reflex	Leaflet drop village	267.38		267.38	Comms
D. Boulter	New keys, fishpond shed	46.50		46.50	CA&E
A. Davis	Litter picking refuse bags	11.94		11.94	CA&E
Amazon	printer ink	43.55	7.26	36.29	Admin
				7,841.94	

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

Topographical Survey

Quotes	Total	Collinson Park	Burial Ground	Ash Tree Park	Fishpond
1	2775	850	650	425	850
2	4000	800	800	800	1600
3	4000	675	1350	625	1350

Quotes for VAT advice

1	2200
2	awaited
3	awaited

Signed Chairman.....

31-Jul-25

£ 149,588.67

426.00

£426.00	£ 150,014.67
---------	--------------

Card	43.55
------	-------

£43.55	£ 149,971.12
--------	--------------

Total £ 137,116.49

£ 149,971.12

RFO, S. Rumsby

PLANNING_– All matters have been referred to the Planning Committee and their comments appear in bold 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. Full Council have been sent all applications upon receipt. If any Councillor wishes to input into the planning consultation process, please inform Planning Committee Chairman and the Clerk and a time extension will be requested as appropriate. Report presented to full Council for ratification.

1. P/2025/00617 - The Barn, Woodside Farm Barton Gate: Listed Building application for the installation of two replacements windows to the south elevation – ***no objections***
2. P/2025/00513 - Land to the north of The Green: Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of the existing agricultural buildings and the erection of up to 70 dwellings, with associated open space, car parking and sustainable drainage – ***to consider response as circulated by 8/7/25***
3. P/2025/00613 - 63 Sutton Crescent: Felling of one Oak tree (of TPO 318) aPollard one oak Tree to a height of 3m (TPO 318)

The oak tree is located in the rear garden of 63 Sutton Crescent. It is covered by a group TPO for trees on the northern boundary of the Sutton Crescent development. The application form notes that the tree is not diseased or that there are any fears that it might fall. An Arboriculturist's report notes that the tree has in the past suffered some harsh pruning. It states that the reason for felling is that it overhangs the garage and that the root protection has been compromised by the foundations of the garage and that the juxtaposition of the garage is limiting the tree's potential development. We also noted that a similar proposal to fell the trees was subject to an application in 2021 but was withdrawn and with no explanation.

Response submitted as per circulated Committee meeting notes

4. P/2025/00587 - 158 Park Road: ***Erection*** of a single storey rear extension, demolition of existing conservatory and alterations to existing openings The proposal is for a flat roof rear extension albeit with a roof light.

Response submitted as per circulated Committee meeting notes

5. P/2025/00483 - Forest Thorn Farmhouse, Scotch Hills Lane: Change of use of land from agricultural to garden land, demolition of existing agricultural barn to facilitate the erection of the single storey triple carport The proposal lies on the south-western boundary of the plot and is at right angles to the previously approved barn conversion under P/2024/00269.

Response submitted as per circulated Committee meeting notes

6. P/2025/00668 - Barton Marina, Barton Turn: (MMA) Application under Section 73 to vary condition 2 (Plans) attached to P/2021/01087 for use of land as proposed Marina car park extension to provide 111 additional parking spaces including 7 disabled bays and 15 Electric vehicle charging points together with new landscaping planting to amend the positioning of the Electric vehicle charging points

The applicants wish to relocate the electrical charging points from the site with planning permission to the main area of parking to the west of the Waterfront complex. This is due in part to the proximity of the substation, and also to reduce the extensive work that would be required over a significant distance. They also state that this greater visibility will encourage increased use and awareness.

Response submitted as per circulated Committee meeting notes

P/2024/01084 - Rhosyn Farm, Scotch Hills Lane: Retention of use as an animal encounter experience (AMENDED site location plan)

Response submitted as per circulated Committee meeting notes

7. P/2025/00610 – 81 Station Road: Two storey rear and side extension, single storey rear extension, enlargement & alterations to existing bay window and installation of roof lights to front elevation (AMENDED DESCRIPTION) - ***No objections***
8. P/2025/00729 - 80 Station Road: Felling of one Norway Spruce tree (T1) - ***No objections and support the applicant's intention to plant a replacement tree***
9. P/2025/00730 - Apple Tree Cottage, Dunstall Road: All over reduction by up to 2m one Sycamore tree (T1), reduce by 50% one Pear tree (T2). - ***No objections***

P/2025/00386 - Malverna, Sich Lane, Woodhouses, Yoxall: Erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension to facilitate the change of use of dwelling (Class 3(a)) to a children's care home (Class 2) for up to 3 children (AMENDED DESCRIPTION & PLANS). **Response submitted as per circulated Committee meeting notes**

10. P/2025/00780 - Park Corner, 83 Main Street: Felling of one Cypress tree - **No objections as per circulated Committee meeting notes**
11. P/2025/00370 - 7 Holly Road: Erection of a part first floor side extension - **No objections as per circulated Committee meeting notes**
12. P/2025/00787 - Thomas Russell Infants School: Prune up to 1m 1 Lawson Cypress tree (G1), crown lift up to 2.5m 1 Common Yew tree (8), crown lift up to 2.2m 1 Common Lime tree (18), crown lift up to 2.3m and prune adjacent spindle 1 Field Maple (19), remove deadwood from 1 Pedunculate Oak tree (20), crown lift low branches up to 2.3m 1 Common Lime tree (22), clean out crown to remove dead and dysfunctional wood 1 Common Ash tree (23), fell both stems to 1 Spindle tree (28), crown lift low branches up to 2.3m 1 Common Lime tree (30), clean out crown to remove dead and dysfunctional wood including removal of broken branch 1 Horse Chestnut tree (46), prune by up to 1m to clear from structure/wires/buildings 1 Norway Maple tree (55), and crown lift up low branches up to 2.2m 1 Hornbeam tree (58) **Response submitted as per circulated Committee meeting notes**
13. P/2025/00666 - Stanmar, Dunstall Road: Application under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for a minor material amendment to vary condition 2 of P/2024/01173 for the demolition of existing garage to facilitate the erection of a part two storey and single storey front, side and rear extension by way of altering dormer to front elevation, removing proposed window to utility room, alterations to windows, installation of flue, installation of solar panels to rear elevation and alterations to eaves heights - **No objections**
14. P/2025/00739 - Whitewood Lodge, Sich Lane, Whitewood, Yoxall: Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness relating to a lawful commencement of the approved conversion including addition of new windows and doors of agricultural building to form dwelling, installation of septic tank, erection of a two bay oak framed building to replace existing outbuilding and formation of a new access in relation to condition 1 of P/2022/00487 **No objections as per circulated Committee meeting notes**
15. P/2025/00693 - Indurent Park, Gateway Road, Barton under Needwood: Retention of 13 no. posts with CCTV camera's and mounted tannoy's - **No objections**
16. P/2025/00747 - 75 Wales Lane: Demolition of single storey side extension to facilitate the erection of a two storey side extension, erection of single storey rear extension and alterations / replacement of fenestrations to all elevations
17. **Statement of Community Involvement – to consider submission of report attached to Committee notes.**

ESBC Decisions – Permissions Granted

1. P/2025/00301 - 108 Main Street: Demolition of rear outbuilding and the erection of two storey rear extension
 2. P/2025/00510 - 114 Main Street: Overall crown reduction up to 1.5 metres or to nearest suitable growth points and prune lateral growth by up to 0.5 metres of one Bay tree
 3. P/2025/00395 - Rear of 26 Causer Road: Pruning back of overhanging garden boundary branches by up to 1.5 metres of one Oak tree (T8 of TPO 388)
 4. P/2023/00304 - 424 Lichfield Road: Formation of replacement access
 5. P/2025/00617 - The Barn, Woodside Farm Barton Gate: Listed Building application for the installation of two replacements windows to the south elevation
-

Barton under Needwood Parish Council

Notes of the Planning Committee Meeting 5:00pm Monday 7th July 2025

Present: Cllrs Hassall, Lord, Sharkey, Wallace and Young
Roger Bell as co-opted member

Election of Committee Chairman

Roger Bell accepted post on an interim basis

Declarations of Interest: None

P/2025/00617 The Barn, Woodside Farm, Barton Gate. Listed Building application for the installation of 2 replacement windows in the southern elevation. This application is for the replacement of upvc with painted timber windows

Resolved: No objection

P/2025/00613 63 Sutton Crescent – felling of an oak tree (TPO ref 318)

The oak tree is located in the rear garden of 63 Sutton Crescent. It is covered by a group TPO for trees on the northern boundary of the Sutton Crescent development. The application form notes that the tree is not diseased or that there are any fears that it might fall. An Arboriculturist's report notes that the tree has in the past suffered some harsh pruning. It states that the reason for felling is that it overhangs the garage and that the root protection has been compromised by the foundations of the garage and that the juxtaposition of the garage is limiting the tree's potential development. We also noted that a similar proposal to fell the tree was subject to an application in 2021 but was withdrawn and with no explanation.

Resolved: We noted the arboriculturist's reference to previous pruning and wonder if that work had been authorized. Looking at the photographs submitted with the application, the tree looks healthy. The fact that the tree is part of the group TPO provides evidence of its amenity value. As there is no evidence that the tree is dead, dying or dangerous, then we see no justification to permit its felling.

P/2025/00587 158 Park Road – erection of a single storey rear extension, demolition of the existing conservatory and alterations to existing openings.

The proposal is for a flat roof rear extension albeit with a roof light.

Resolved: No objection in principle but we query the incongruity of the flat roof design with the steeply pitched roof of the host property. In that sense, we question whether it meets the requirements of Policies SP 24 and DP 1 where development needs to respond positively to the context of the surroundings. Whilst we recognize and appreciate the design dilemma, we just wonder if alternative designs have been investigated.

P/2025/00483 Forest Thorn Farmhouse, Scotch Hills Lane – change of use of land from agricultural garden land, demolition of existing agricultural barn to facilitate the erection of the single storey triple car port

The proposal lies on the south-western boundary of the plot and is at right angles to the previously approved barn conversion under P/2024/00269.

Resolved: No objections in principle, although we question whether black timber cladding represents vernacular rural Staffordshire materials. As the majority of this site is in residential use it inevitably now exhibits a domestic character. That being the case, we feel that there is perhaps the need to define boundaries with the open countryside beyond. We would, therefore, suggest a need for structural landscaping of trees and/or hedgerows along the southern and western boundaries.

Needwood Barbers

Suggested Note to be sent to ESBC: A local resident has highlighted to the Committee the newly erected black plastic sign for Needwood Barbers on Main Street. Looking at the ESBC website we can see no evidence of a planning application for the sign which we believe needs permission due to its location within the conservation area. The sign looks overly large for the size of the shop façade, and we also understand that it may have the potential to be illuminated. We note the reference in the Shopfronts Design SPD October 2019 that it is key that applicants closely follow this guidance so as to preserve and enhance the conservation area. We, therefore, wanted to draw this issue to your attention and request that you investigate accordingly.

Rhosyn Farm

Suggested Note to be sent to ESBC: Local residents have drawn to the Committee's attention the continuing intensity of traffic problems associated with the events at Rhosyn Farm. Residents feel that the existing agricultural access is inappropriate for the volume of traffic now using this private road. We understand that these issues have led to frustrations and issues of trespass and, in one instance, verbal abuse. We are informed that events can run from 09:30am to 21:00pm which has an effect on the amenities of local residents and their peaceful enjoyment of their properties and the adjacent countryside. On behalf of these local residents, we just wanted to echo their concerns about the impact on the amenities of the surrounding rural area. Whilst we fully appreciate the permitted development issues for glamping, and the 28 day rule for weddings, a planning application for the animal encounter experience was submitted some time ago and has still not yet been determined (P/2024/01084). This would suggest that the applicants intended to run this experience on a permanent basis. We can also only assume that as this was a retrospective planning application then, if indeed, the 28 day rule also applied to this use, then this allowance has now been surpassed. We are also concerned that the outstanding planning application for the retention of a mobile home as an agricultural worker's dwelling for a temporary period of three years (P/2020/01336) has still not yet been determined. As this application was submitted five years ago then we assume that the investigation of any agricultural justification case has presumably now been completed. We would, therefore, be grateful, if on behalf of these residents you would investigate these concerns and hope that you will be in a position to determine both these applications as soon as practically possible. In addition, if there is expected to be further delay, we request that the council consider whether enforcement action is appropriate

P/2025/00513 Land to the north of The Green. Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of the existing agricultural buildings and the erections of up to 70 dwellings with associated open space, car parking and sustainable drainage.

Discussion took place around the working draft as previously circulated. Reference was also made to ESBC's recent report confirming that they still have a five year supply of housing.

Cllr Lord set out his concerns regarding the strategy for surface water drainage, Severn Trent's statement that the local sewerage network is at capacity and that there was no budgetary provision at present to make improvements. We, therefore, concluded that the site was undeliverable at least in the short term. Cllr Lord will write to Severn Trent to explain that their modelling under predicts flooding issues. Cllr Lord will draft an insert into the working draft with a view that we pull the various elements of a submission to ESBC together at the next Planning Committee meeting – the deadline for making comments having been extended to 27th July.

Cllr Sharkey will draft a letter to the Chief Executive of ESBC expressing the concern of a number of Parish Councils regarding the impact of possibly permitting opportunistic planning applications in rural areas and villages in advance of the review of the Local Plan. Cllr Sharkey will also speak to the Case Officer dealing with The Green and explain the Parish Council's concerns so that she is aware of the wider issue being sent to the CE.

Resolved: (1) ES to draft a leaflet to be sent to all residents informing them of the planning application and requesting them to make any comments as appropriate on the application to ESBC. The leaflet will set out the Parish Council's concerns regarding the planning application in relation to current planning policy, drainage, highway and traffic impact and landscaping.

(2) CW to organize distribution of the leaflets

(3) ES to draft a letter to local schools and the GP surgery asking for information concerning the capacity of local services and, what impact an additional 70 houses might have on them.

(3) ES to make representations to the SCC Cabinet Member for Highways to ensure SCC Highways Development Control properly review and comment on the highway network impacts of the development

(4) DL to engage with drainage authorities

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 22nd July 2025 at 5:00pm in the Small Meeting Room

Barton under Needwood Parish Council

Notes of the Planning Committee Meeting Tuesday 22nd July 2025

Present: Cllrs Hassall, Lord, Sharkey and Roger Bell

Declarations of Interest: None

P/2025/00513 Land to the north of The Green: Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of the existing agricultural buildings and the erection of up to 70 dwellings, with associated open space, car parking and sustainable drainage

The Parish Council had prepared a consultation leaflet, and this was being distributed to all houses in the village. Cllr Sharkey noted that he was surprised at how many people were not aware of the application. The comments which the PC had received appeared to raise no new issues, although the paucity of the mobile signal was mentioned.

Cllr Lord had made enquiries of Severn Trent. It was understood that any upgrading of the STW was not in the current programme for works. If permitted then it would be regarded as an obligation, but to be provided possibly from 2030 onwards. If this was the case, then Cllr Lord noted that it would fall outside the demand for the current five-year supply period.

Cllr Lord felt that the proposed drainage strategy would not work as the proposed ponds were 1m deep and the ditches which received the flow were only ½ m deep. The pond sizes, therefore, would have to be increased and so this would be likely to have an effect on the number of houses that could be accommodated. Apparently not all houses could be connected to the existing gravity foul drainage and, therefore, outflow from one part of the site might have to be pumped to the other but no provision for this had been made on site.

It was queried as to whether the position of the proposed access could achieve an adequate visibility splay. If that were the case, then the access might have to be moved further to the west, and this would affect the existing pond. If so, then any visibility splay here would affect the hedgerow on the road frontage. Also, it was thought that the existing Dogshead Lane junction with Bar Lane had poor visibility and so this might also need to be improved.

We were still trying to discover the situation regarding local services, but from phone and e-mail discussion and correspondence between Cllr Sharkey and the Head Teachers, we understand that the Junior and Infant Schools were, more or less, at capacity. We are still awaiting a response to an enquiry to the John Taylor MATS about capacity at the High School. Cllr Sharkey also e-mailed the Practice Manager at Barton Health Centre. From experiences on Causer Road we also felt that it was important for ESBC to act now to provide protection to trees and hedgerows on the site.

Agreed: that all Planning Committee members consider Cllr Lord's revised and amended version of the working draft response and make any comments to Roger Bell as soon as practically possible. The intention is to have a definitive version for distribution to the full Parish Council by say Wednesday 30th July in good time for consideration at its meeting on 7th August. The report will be written in the form of a recommendation to the full Parish Council for submission to ESBC.

P/2025/00668 - Barton Marina Application under S73 to vary condition 2 attached to permission P/2021/01087 for the use of land as marina car park extension to provide 111 additional parking spaces including 7 disabled bays and 15 electric vehicle charging points together with new landscaping planting to amend the positioning of the electric vehicle charging points.

The applicants wish to relocate the electrical charging points from the site with planning permission to the main area of parking to the west of the Waterfront complex. This is due in part to the proximity of the substation, and also to reduce the extensive work that would be required over a significant distance. They also state that this greater visibility will encourage increased use and awareness.

Resolved: No objections, in principle, but note that the location plan identifies the proposed parking area but only shows the relocated charging points as an insert rather than as a clear location within the full Marina complex. The accompanying statement also refers to the parking layout being amended but there appears to be no difference on the submitted drawings. We are also concerned that, assuming cabling is required in the revised location then this might affect the existing trees and so some form of landscape restoration might be necessary, which has not been identified.

P/2024/01084 Rhosyn Farm, Scotch Hills Lane: the retention of use of an animal encounter experience, as amended.

This application was submitted last year as a retrospective proposal to recognize the existing business taking place on this site. We objected to the proposal as being contrary to Local Plan policies SP 8 for development outside settlement boundaries, Policy SP 14 Rural economy and Policy SP 15 Tourism, culture and leisure development. In particular, the policies indicated that farm diversification could be supported where they make a long term contribution to sustaining the agricultural enterprise as a whole and where this is environmentally compatible. We felt that the applicants had not provided sufficient evidence to justify the proposal accordingly.

This amendment relates to traffic management proposals at the road junction access and along the private drive to ease traffic flow and minimize disruption to adjoining properties. Proposals include signing and passing places.

Resolved: That the Parish Council maintains and reiterates its objection in principle as originally submitted. We believe that the proposals for signing and passing places are internal arrangements and do not address the principle of whether or not this is an appropriate use for the land, and the planning policy issues, as we set out in our comments. We assume that the passing places may require land in the applicant's ownership on the north side of the private drive. The drawing fails to identify these exact locations on a reasonable scale plan and if additional land was required then this should have been incorporated within the red outline of the application. We note that the proposal states that they are currently operating under the 28 day permitted development rules, but the application submitted last year was a retrospective application which assumes that the experience had been operating for some time suggesting that their allowance may well have been used up. Some information about how many operating days had been used would be helpful, especially as this experience seems to operate all

year round. Although it is strictly not a planning issue, it would also have been helpful to have had some information about the status and the rights over the private drive and whether or not this allows for more than just agricultural traffic. The traffic flows along this track will also have to cope with not only the “Experience” traffic but also other existing events including, we understand, weddings and glamping.

P/2025/00610 81 Station Road: two storey rear and side extension, single storey rear extension, enlargement and alterations to existing bay window and installation of roof lights to front elevation.

Resolved: No objections

P/2025/00613- 63 Sutton Crescent: pollard one oak tree to the height of 3m(TPO 318)

An earlier version of this application proposed the felling of this oak tree. We objected on the grounds that, as it was not dead, dying or dangerous then, there was no justification for undertaking what seemed like a drastic solution. This amended application now proposes pollarding rather than felling. In addition, the technical report recommends that the tree is not replaced but without any reasoning. This description of pollarding, however, does not match either the application form or the arboricultural report both of which still refer to felling. Whilst there are a number of accompanying photographs, these only go to demonstrate the amenity value of the tree. They do not show what a pollarded tree at the proposed height would look like.

Resolved: This looks like it is a substantial tree with considerable amenity value. As there is no evidence or photographs to accompany what is now proposed by way of pollarding then we can do no other but to maintain our objection, on the basis that is not dead, dying or dangerous. We believe that the default position should be to retain the tree, and any proposed works need to be fully justified.

P/2025/00386- Malverna Sich Lane: Erection of a single single storey front, side and rear extension to facilitate the change of use of the dwelling (Class 3a) to a children’s care home (Class 2) for up to 3 children

A resident, via e-mail, notified the Parish Council that this application has been amended to include various extensions. They also expressed concerns about the number of vehicles using the adjoining Yew Tree House on a daily basis. Today, 23rd July, ESBC notified us about this application

Agreed: The application will be considered at the next meeting of the Planning Committee on 4th August

Correspondence regarding the Home Farm proposal at Dunstall (P/2021/01502 and 01504)

These applications were considered recently at ESBC's Planning Committee. It was deferred for future consideration regarding further highway information, in particular relating to whether any traffic management or mitigating proposals would be considered appropriate. As an adjoining Parish Council, we expressed our view about the impact of increased traffic generated by the development on our local road network. Whilst it is probably beyond our remit to make any further comments, we believe that, on the basis of our local knowledge and experience, it is difficult to see how effective any mitigating highway measures might be without affecting the character and the countryside environment of Dunstall and the surrounding area.

Resolved: That we respond to the residents accordingly

Bellways Travel Plan

The Parish Council responded to the County Council in October 2024 regarding the final monitoring report of the Bellways Travel Plan. We felt that there were still outstanding issues that had not been resolved. We have not had any response from the County Council. In particular, a bus stop sign had been removed from the east side of Efflinch Lane when the residential development commenced, and it has still not been replaced. Providing a bus shelter along Efflinch Lane was a proposal of the Travel Plan, but this has not been implemented and we have heard nothing further. In addition, there were outstanding issues from earlier iterations of the Travel Plan Monitoring Reports.

Resolved: Send a gentle reminder to the County Council requesting a response.

ESBC Statement of Community Involvement

The Parish Council has been consulted on the update of this document which sets out how ESBC will involve the community in its various planning documents and services. In particular, we believe the reason for consulting on this document now is to set out the process of consultation for preparing a review of the Local Plan.

Agreed: Roger Bell to consider the document and assess the need for any response and bring this forward at the next meeting

Date of next meeting
5:00pm Monday 4th August 2025

Barton under Needwood Parish Council

Notes of the Planning Committee Meeting 4th August 2025

Present : Cllrs Hassall, Sharkey, Wallace and Young
Roger Bell as co-opted member

Declarations of Interest: None

P/2025/00513 Land to the north of The Green: Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of the existing agricultural buildings and erection of up to 70 dwellings with associated open space, car parking and sustainable drainage
Cllr Sharkey said that he had met with representatives from Staffordshire County Council and had urged them to press their development control colleagues to consider, with some urgency, their response as local highways authority. He was told that they were still considering the application but had some issues, regarding the nearby junction and the impact on the access to the A38.

Roger Bell referred to an article from the Daily Telegraph where at a village in Buckinghamshire the local authority had approved an application for 153 houses despite the sewage works being at capacity.

Agreed: that the previously circulated report be re-affirmed as the recommendation of the Planning Committee to the full Parish Council that it formally objects to the proposal

P/2025/00729 80 Station Road – Felling of one Norway spruce tree within the Conservation Area

Resolved: No objections and support the applicant's intention to plant a replacement tree

P/2025/00730 Apple Tree Cottage Dunstall Road – All over reduction by up to 2m of one sycamore tree and a 50% reduction of one pear tree in the conservation area

Resolved: No objections

P/2025/00386 “Malverna”, Sich Lane Woodhouses, Yoxall – Erection of a single storey front side and rear extension to facilitate the change of use of dwelling to a children's home for up to 3 children

A planning application for the conversion of this property to a children's care home was submitted earlier this year. The Parish Council objected to the proposal as being contrary to Policy SP 8 Development outside settlement boundaries, SP 14 Rural Economy and DP 7 Pollution and Contamination.

This amendment proposes front, side and rear extensions of Malverna, which are very similar, if not the same, as proposals which gained permission in 2023 (P/2023/00762). On considering these amendments, Policy DP 3 is helpful. This states that extensions to an existing dwelling outside settlement boundaries should be modest or necessary to improve a substandard dwelling. No evidence has been provided as to the state of the property, substandard or otherwise. It looks like these extensions in total are substantial and we, therefore, question whether they meet the criterion of being “modest”.

Resolved: The Parish Council maintains and reiterates its objections to the original proposal to convert this property into a care home. In addition, we also believe that the

proposed extensions do not fall into the category of being modest, and, therefore, wish to add an objection that they are contrary to Policy DP 3. The attached report represents the Council's additional comments on this proposal

P/2025/00780 Park Road Corner, 83 Main Street – Felling of one cypress tree within the conservation area

Resolved: No objections but recommend to ESBC that they request the applicants plant a replacement tree on the Main Street frontage to maintain the amenity value of this tree cover

P/2025/00370 7 Holly Road – Erection of a part first floor side extension

This proposal essentially fills in a gap on the front elevation at first floor level

Resolved: No objections and note that the proposal will help to improve the front elevation and symmetry of the property.

P/2025/00787 Thomas Russell Infants School – Various works to trees within the grounds and the conservation area

This application is accompanied by a comprehensive arboricultural report which considers the trees within the grounds of the school and makes recommendation based on a range of priorities.

Resolved: The amount of work proposed does not appear unreasonable. The problem we have is that, obviously, we have not had the opportunity to go on site and assess the proposals. We do express concern, however, that the various location plans – copies from Google earth - are too indistinct and opaque as to clearly identify the exact location of the trees. No objections, but on the understanding that ESBC's tree officer is able to look at these proposals in detail and on site.

P/2025/00666 Stanmar, Dunstall Road – minor amendments to the planning application already approved under P/2024/01173 for the demolition of the existing garage to facilitate the erection of a part two storey and single storey front, side and rear extension by way of altering a dormer on the front elevation, removing a proposed window to the utility room, alterations to windows, the installation of a flue, installation of solar panels to the rear elevation and alterations to eaves heights

These are relatively minor amendments. To what has already been approved. We support the amended design to the dormer preferring the small pitch design rather than the square look on the approved plan.

Resolved; No objections

P/2025/00739 Whitewood Sich Lane, Whitewood, Yoxall – Certificate of Lawfulness relating to a lawful commencement of the approved conversion including the addition of new windows and doors to the agricultural building to form a dwelling. Installation of a septic tank, erection of a two-bay oak framed building to replace existing outbuilding and formation of a new access to condition 1 of P/2022/00487

This proposal consists of amendments to the original permission. Looking on Google earth the new access road looks like it has been constructed. The applicants want to make amendments to what has previously been approved and have submitted this application accordingly.

Resolved: No objections to these amended works. Looking on Google earth, we can see the new access road. It also shows a route or track taking access from the road immediately to the west of the new access road. This then heads straight in a north easterly direction following the boundary of the field and then turns 90 degrees into the direction of the Whitewood complex. If this has been constructed to assist with any work being undertaken as part of these proposals, then we would like to suggest that the land be made good and be returned to agricultural use.

P/2025/00693 Indurent Park , Gateway Road Barton under Needwood - Retention of 13 posts with CCTV cameras and mounted tannoy.

This is a retrospective application. The only issue we can foresee is the possible use of the tannoy, which may cause disturbance to nearby residential properties, but the accompanying statement says that this will only be used in emergencies.

Resolved: No objections

Statement of Community Involvement

The Parish Council has been consulted on this document which sets out how ESBC will consult on the various documents it produces including the Local Plan. It also sets out how it will engage with the public for the determination of planning applications.

Resolved: That the Parish Council submit the attached report as representing its comments on this document.

Note: refer to two attached documents

- (1) Additional comments of Malverna, Sich Lane – P/2025/00386**
- (2) Comments on the Statement of Community Involvement**

Date of Next Meeting

5:00pm Tuesday 26th August 2025

Barton under Needwood Parish Council

Parish Council Meeting 7th August 2025

Report of the Planning Committee

P/2025/00513

Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of the existing agricultural buildings and the erection of up to 70 dwellings with associated open space, car parking and sustainable drainage on land to the north of The Green

Summary of the main points of concern and objection

- The site is not allocated for residential use in the Local Plan and lies outside of the settlement boundary for the village, where restrictive planning policies apply;
 - The site has been identified In the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2021) as not suitable, achievable, deliverable and developable;
 - The site is contrary to the Policy SP 2 Settlement Hierarchy and Development Strategy which directs development to the most sustainable locations;
 - The Local Plan under Policies SP 3 and SP4 has allocated enough land to meet the housing needs of the village until the end of the plan period;
 - According to a report (May 2025), the Borough Council has 5.13 years supply;
 - The Applicant's Housing Needs Survey only supplies data at a Borough wide level and provides no evidence as to why this particular site, in this particular village should be released;
 - The Transport Assessment appears to be a desk-top study which fails to take account of the day-to-day experience of life coping with traffic in the village;
 - Whilst the illustrative design layout contains some good ideas, in the light of our past experience with the Causer Road development off Efflinch Lane then the trees and hedgerows need protection at this early stage;
 - Severn Trent Water has commented that there is insufficient capacity to accept foul flows from the site. There is no budgetary provision for any upgrading work, and it is not included in any current programme;
 - Surface water drainage will discharge into a combined sewer;
 - No land has been set aside for a pumping station on site;
 - We believe that the drainage situation makes the site undeliverable, at least in the short term, and, therefore, we cannot see that how it can make a contribution to the five-year supply as the Applicants claim.
-

Introduction

1.1 An application, in outline, has been submitted by Providence Land Ltd to develop 4.5ha of grade 3 agricultural land for up to 70 houses on land off The Green. The site is irregular in shape and sits to the rear of properties fronting The Green including the Royal Oak PH. The western boundary describes an arc in a south westerly direction from the current built-up edge of the Park Road development. The site is bordered by hedgerows and scattered trees. Ditches run along both the western and southern boundaries of the site and there is an existing pond which lies alongside what is proposed as the access into the site along this open fronted part of The Green. Access to the site requires the demolition of some, partly open sided agricultural structures. The land is in agricultural use as grassland and is sub-divided by a line of hedgerow.

1.2 Although submitted in outline as a means of testing the principle of whether residential development is acceptable on the site, the application is accompanied by a range of documents. These include a Planning and Sustainability Statement, a Housing Needs Survey, a Heritage Statement, a Flood Risk Assessment, a Design and Access Statement and a Transport Assessment. There is also an illustrative layout to demonstrate how 70 houses might be accommodated on the site.

Parish Council Comments

Planning Policy Considerations

2.1 Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This means that the Local Planning Authority has to assess the proposal against the planning policies contained in the Local Plan as well as considering the merits of the proposal itself and any other relevant considerations. This will include the government's planning policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2.2 In May, the Parish Council was forewarned of this impending application by agents for the applicants who told us that they were undertaking a consultation exercise in the village as a prelude to the submission of this application. We encouraged the applicants to undertake as extensive a consultation as possible in the time allowed.

2.3 The site is not allocated for development in the Local Plan. The Local Plan was adopted in 2015 and as stated in the document "Note on 5 Year Land Supply Methodology" dated March 2025, the Local Plan continues to meet the housing needs of the Borough up to 2030. Sufficient land has, therefore, been allocated to meet the needs of the Borough including Barton under Needwood village up to 2030.

2.4 We understand that ESBC has recently published a Local Development Scheme which establishes a timetable for a review of this Local Plan. The aim is to have a new Local Plan adopted by December 2028. If that date is achieved, then it will be well within the current

Local Plan period. Logic, therefore, dictates that the proposed site is not required within the current Local Plan period. It will be open, of course, to the applicants to promote the site as a potential allocation in the revised Local Plan, when it can be considered as against other potential sites to meet any identified future need.

2.5 The site has been identified in the Borough Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2021 (SHLAA). This looks at the potential of sites to meet the Borough's five years supply of housing, but inclusion in the Assessment does not bring with it any confirmation that it should be developed. The site was found to be not suitable, achievable, deliverable and developable.

2.6 The site lies outside, but albeit adjacent to the settlement boundary of the village. This defines the built-up part of Barton and means that the principle of development inside the boundary is acceptable, whereas development outside the boundary falls into the open countryside, where restrictive planning policies apply. Here Policy SP 8 states that development will not be permitted unless it meets a range of criteria, for example, if it is essential to meet the needs of an existing business or it is otherwise appropriate in the countryside. If it meets one of these criteria then there is a second range of hoops that it also has to address. We cannot see that this proposal meets any of the criteria of Policy SP 8 as, for example, housing is not regarded as otherwise appropriate in the open countryside. We, therefore, object to the proposal as being contrary to Policy SP 8.

2.7 The Local Plan sets out a Settlement Hierarchy. Policy SP 2 Settlement Hierarchy directs development to the most sustainable locations. The most sustainable locations are defined as Burton and Uttoxeter. The second tier in the hierarchy includes four 'Strategic Villages' which are Tutbury, Barton Rocester and Rolleston. Further down the hierarchy are what are referred to as Local Service Villages and then Small Villages and Settlements. The further down the hierarchy you go the less the amount of housing development is proposed as these are less sustainable settlements.

2.8 This is also reflected in the provision of homes and jobs as set out in Policies SP 3 and SP 4 which allocates housing numbers to these layers of the hierarchy. The implication is that you direct development to these more sustainable locations, in terms of services and facilities, so that you restrict development elsewhere. In this way, the Local Plan sets out a development strategy for the whole borough. In that sense, approval for a substantial amount of housing development in Barton may have a negative impact on the development strategy. We, therefore, object to the proposal as being contrary to Policies SP 2,3 and 4. If, for whatever reason, further housing, over and above the Local Plan figures, is deemed to be required then the development strategy surely dictates that it should be directed, in the first instance, to the most sustainable locations, i.e. Burton and Uttoxeter. In accordance with the NPPF guidance sites allocated must also be capable of delivery within 5 years.

Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

3.1 Government policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024 (NPPF) is regarded as a material consideration. This has recently been updated in view of the Government's proposals for growth which include the target of providing 1.5m homes over the next five years. To meet this requirement a local housing need figure for each district has been identified. This is expressed purely in terms of a nationally derived figure and for East Staffordshire this is proposed to be 602 houses pa. This is above the 546 houses pa found in the Local Plan (10384 over the period 2012 to 2031). Local Planning Authorities are also required to monitor the supply of housing to demonstrate that there is a readily available supply of land to meet housing needs over a period of five years.

3.2 In the short term, a report to ESBC's Cabinet Meeting 24th March 2025 noted that this national need for further housing is likely to result in a reduction of the housing land supply. The report also suggests that, due to the increased housing requirement, the ability to maintain a 5 year supply is likely to become more difficult. The implication of this is that where a housing land supply falls below 5 years then the weight that can be afforded to housing policies reduces.

3.3 Just recently, in May 2025, ESBC produced a paper on the current status of the five-year supply as at year ending March 2025. This stated that there was a supply figure of 5.13 years, based on an annual housing need of 637. We note that this annual figure is above the government's estimated global figure for the Borough of 602 houses pa. Whilst the overall supply has reduced, we can only conclude that the Borough still has a five-year supply and, in addition, that this is above the Government's prescribed per annum target.

3.4 The applicant's Planning and Sustainability Statement asserts in paras 4.12 and 4.13 that ESBC does not have a five-year supply. They then argue that, because there is no five-year supply then, their application should be approved. We find this assertion hard to believe and understand especially because, when this Statement was written, the latest information available was that the Borough had a housing supply of 7.37 years. This latest calculation still confirms a five-year supply even taking into account the government's revised estimates. Even if the figure had been slightly below the five-year figure, we cannot believe that it was the intention of the NPPF to immediately permit development proposals anywhere, without consideration of sustainability and compliance with local plan policies, presumably until sufficient land had been permitted to reach a new five-year supply. That doesn't make sense and is contrary to the whole idea of planning. You surely still have to assess the proposal against the Local Plan policies and what they are trying to achieve, and here we believe that the settlement hierarchy and the development strategy are both still relevant and valid.

3.5 Para 78 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and update a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five-year's worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in the adopted Local Plan or against local

housing need where the policies are more than five years old. This requirement relates to the SHLAA, (para. 2.5) above.

3.6 Within the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy dated May 2025, the Applicants include a response from Severn Trent Water (STW) which states that, *“Due to the nature of the development, the additional flows and existing flood and surcharge levels, there is insufficient capacity within the Severn Trent network at present and modelling will be required, which may show that improvements are required to the Severn Trent network. We are undergoing a prioritisation process of all investment requirements and emerging risks from growth on our network and treatment works as we build our plan for the coming Asset Management Plan period (2025-2030) and beyond.”* This response indicates that STW will require to undertake improvements to the Barton sewerage network, but these will only take place beyond the current programme AMP period i.e. post 2030. This means that, even if approved, this site is not going to make any contribution to the current five-year housing supply.

3.7 A similar consideration is set out in the Applicant’s Transport Assessment. This assumes that final completion of the site will be by 2035, also taking us – at least in part, if not in total - beyond the current five-year supply calculations.

3.8 We recognise, however, that the government’s enhanced housing requirements for the Borough mean that additional housing provision will need to be made. The logical way of achieving this is through a review of the Local Plan which will have to allocate land, to meet these higher targets. This is a far more rational approach where all potential sites can be assessed, rather than permitting ad hoc and opportunistic proposals.

3.9 From what we understand, all we have in terms of projected housing trends is a projected housing figure for each local planning authority area derived from a national calculation of housing need. What applies in Battersea may not be the same as in Barton and, therefore, presumably these housing figures can be challenged as not reflecting local needs or circumstances. We recall that, when the Local Plan was prepared, all authorities had to prepare what was called a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This considered population and migration trends, the need for affordable housing and of what type, be it social housing or low-cost housing for sale, housing size, densities, housing markets and need in geographical areas. All of this data is best collected at a borough wide level. We assume that ESBC will be undertaking a similar exercise this time round as a means of being able to influence and update their detailed housing policies. With this type of detailed evidence, it may be that the government’s figure is higher or lower than what might be the appropriate amount for the Borough. And whatever housing figure is promoted can be subject to debate through the Local Plan Examination in Public process. That is the rational way to proceed, and so we believe that, in the light of what information we have, at the present time, there is no need to release this site

The Applicant's Housing Needs Survey

3.10 The NPPF (para 82) states that in rural areas planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. To promote sustainable development in rural areas, the NPPF asserts that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

3.11 In order to support their proposal, the applicants have produced a Housing Needs Survey. Their survey identifies the number of households in the village at the 2021 Census as 2,091. It then identifies a 10% increase in households in the Borough as a whole over the next decade and applies this 10% increase to Barton as revealing a figure of 2300 households. This is a very simplistic way of calculating need as, due to the development strategy, housing growth is unlikely to be uniform over the whole borough.

3.12 The Housing Needs Survey (para 3.2.1) notes a shortfall in affordable housing of 6935 households in the Borough. This is obviously a high number but there is no further breakdown in terms how this figure has been calculated, or what that figure might mean for Barton. The Parish Council has recognised for some time that there is a need for affordable housing in the village and has campaigned to achieve this. This need also came across in our own recent survey in 2024, quoted by the applicants.

3.13 As we mentioned in para 2.2 above, the applicants also conducted a short questionnaire survey. Despite the applicants wanting to establish the principle of development, through an outline application, it was unfortunate that no information was forthcoming about any opposition to the site. Their survey reveals that there were a number of responses which supported starter homes, and they also set out the number in favour of 2, 3, and 4 bedroom houses. They take this as evidence of demand for their proposal. On the basis of this survey, however, we cannot believe that housing need has been adequately defined or is critically rigorous enough to warrant it being a material consideration to justify overruling the policies of the local plan.

3.14 The Parish Council has spoken to the local schools. From what we can gather from these discussions, the Infant and the Junior Schools are, more or less, at capacity. We have also spoken to the Barton Family Practice. They have expressed concern that, with such an increase in patients, they would have difficulty coping with that level of demand, that it would have an impact on the quality and accessibility of care that they could provide. Of course, more housing will provide additional customers for village shops and businesses, but in the light of these capacity issues, we cannot believe that a further 70 houses, with the attendant impact on local services, will contribute to enhancing or maintaining the vitality of the community as required by the NPPF.

Transport Assessment

3.15 The applicant's Transport Assessment concludes that the baseline transport conditions show that there is a very good active travel network including an extensive public footpath

network, a national cycle route, a regular bus service and that Barton is close to the A 38. It indicates that the proposal can link seamlessly into this existing network. They suggest, for example, that the site access and the Wales Lane/Main Street junctions can operate well within the road capacity. This is based on a single day's survey during what they claim to be peak hours, but which actually misses the peak time of 15.30 -16.00 when schools close.

3.16 This may be fine from a technical desk study, but it is far from the day-to-day experience of local people. Travel along Main Street at any time but especially during peak flows at school opening and closing times is tortuous. Flow is hindered not just by sheer volumes but also by the presence of parked cars, often on both sides of the road. This means that queues of cars often build up behind parked vehicles, to allow for traffic to pass from the opposite direction as the Main Street carriageway narrows. The junction of Wales Lane with Main Street is particularly affected at these times of day. Again, parked cars on the eastern side of Wales Lane close to the junction narrow the carriageway and this makes traffic flows difficult for two reasons – for larger vehicles turning into Wales Lane, and also for traffic queueing and wishing to turn left or right onto Main Street. This junction is also used by public transport.

3.17 We believe that, as the proposal is located on the opposite side of the village, some distance from all three schools then, there will be a temptation for parents to use their cars to ferry their children to school, thus adding to the additional traffic at this junction. We, therefore, find it very hard to believe, if we have interpreted Table 11 correctly, that the Traffic Assessment's current delay at the Wales Lane/Main Street junction is only 11 seconds (peak AM) and 12 seconds (peak PM) and that adding traffic from the additional 70 houses will barely add a second or so.

3.18 It appears that the Assessment has only modelled this junction and Bar Lane/ The Green/Dogshead Lane, which we believe is short sighted. What happens in practice is that drivers perceive a queue at the Wales Lane/ Main Street junction and within Main Street and so decide to take alternative routes thus increasing traffic flows on nearby roads and at other junctions with Main Street. The Dogshead Lane/A38 Catholme Junction northbound access, fondly used by satellite navigation systems, is also problematic and avoided by residents as the acceleration lane and visibility is below national (DMRB) standards.

3.19 The Assessment claims that *"The site access has been designed to be compliant with Manual for Streets design requirements"*. The MfS has a requirement for a separation of at least 30m between offset junctions and for the development access to Bar Lane/The Green/Dogshead Lane. This measures at about 33 m. Visibility splay at the junction has been set at x 2.4 m and y 43 m. What is not explicitly declared is that, in order to deliver the visibility splay, it is necessary to remove the boundary hedge to the west of the access, impacting on and exposing the pond. Provision of fencing or replacing the hedgerow at the rear of the splay would be problematic as it would be located within the pond. The width of Bar Lane at the proposed junction is less than the MfS required 5m. This proposed junction layout does not take into account that the sight lines from Dogshead Lane towards the entrance in Bar Lane are substandard. We believe that this would result in road safety implications which would be compounded by the proposed position of the access. This would suggest that there is a need for a rethink of the access arrangements into the site.

3.20 We also believe that the Assessment contains some significant errors:-

- It is stated that Bar Lane is a rural road with minimal active frontages. This may be so, but all of the active frontages are in proximity to the development and some only have on street parking. The report also fails to identify that there are locations of substandard road width which impacts on flow of traffic;
- For The Green/Wales Lane the Assessment states *“There are no parking restrictions and most properties fronting this corridor have off street parking”*. This is simply untrue as there are long sections of road where properties have no offroad parking. This causes a significant impediment to free flow of traffic, especially at the junction of Wales Lane and Main Street;
- In the section on accidents, the Assessment claims there are very, limited records and none in proximity to the development proposed access. The reality is that there have been 4 accidents in which errant vehicles have crashed into and demolished the front wall of 76 The Green in the last 3 years. Residents have been so concerned by actual accidents and near misses in the area of Bar Lane/The Green/Dogshead Lane that they set up a residents’ action group. Staffordshire County Council, as the local highway authority, is currently investigating this junction.

3.21 The Assessment notes that aside from vehicle trips the most significant mode of traffic at 7% is by walking. This may be so, and we welcome the proposals in the illustrative layout for links to the public footpath network, but it seems to ignore the fact that 73% of traffic is by car. The Assessment does not seem to make any provision for attempting to reduce the use of the private car and does not, for example, make any recommendations for the promotion of public transport or indeed for a Travel Plan.

Design and Access Statement

3.22 We appreciate that the applicants have produced an illustrative layout to demonstrate how 70 houses might be accommodated on site. There are some good, constructive ideas here and we applaud their proposals for open space and green corridors, footpath links to the existing public network, the retention of trees and hedgerows, and sustainable drainage. It also appears as though smaller house types are distributed throughout the development rather than harboured in ghettos. Despite the applicants referencing ESBC’s excellent Design Guide we still feel that the layout could be more creative and have more flair. There needs to be a range of house types and design styles and long straight rows of houses need to be avoided.

3.23 We feel that the Design Statement is a good starting point, but we do not wish to dwell too much on this as, in the light of our previous experience, the eventual design is likely to reflect the desires of the future housebuilder rather than the aspirations of the developer.

3.24 Thought should be given, even at this stage, to declaring a group TPO for the site and the protection of hedgerows, so that future purchasers of properties are aware of the importance of their amenity value. In the case of the Causer Road development off Efflinch Lane, TPOs were designated for the boundary trees. As a Parish Council we have submitted comments on many applications for permission to fell or lop branches etc. The lesson from this is that in designing any future layout, more thought and attention needs to be taken of the amenity value of these trees. This may mean ensuring adequate plot sizes and ensuring that buildings do not affect root growth.

3.25 In the Causer Road development off Efflinch Lane, many houses, have lost integral garages to additional residential space and in the process front gardens have been lost to provide additional parking. Plot sizes also perhaps need to take account of the possibility of future rear extensions. Any layout, therefore, needs to be designed in such a way as to reduce the potential for overlooking and surface water run-off.

3.26 We are concerned by the claim that the existing pond fronting Bar Lane will be enhanced for biological net gain. At present, this pond receives run-off from the undeveloped site. The effect of development is such that most of this run-off will be removed resulting in a reduction in water supply such that the pond may dry out. It will also be adversely impacted by the removal of the hedge/margins to accommodate the access visibility splay.

3.27 We also understand from our expert's analysis that the attenuation basins will require to be much larger and foul and surface water pumping stations will be required. It is likely, therefore, that available space for house plots will be reduced and, as a consequence, the number of houses to be accommodated on site could be less than 70.

3.28 We are heartened by para. 137 of the NPPF which indicates that design is integral to development. It states, *"Early discussion between applicants, the local planning authority and local community about the design and style of emerging schemes is important for clarifying expectations and reconciling local and commercial interests. Applicantsshould work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community"*. Whilst we were pleased that the Applicants undertook a brief consultation prior to the submission of this application, we were disappointed that the survey took place obviously after all the accompanying documents had been prepared. There was, therefore, little opportunity for the local community to make any contribution to the design and nature of the proposals, as required by the NPPF. Whilst all of these issues are for another time, we would like to place on record, even at this outline stage, the need to take the issues we have raised into account in any future detailed design.

Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy

3.29 A review of this document has been undertaken by Derek Lord C.ENG, MICE, MCIWEM, a drainage expert with significant experience of reviewing FRAs on behalf of Lead Local Flood Authorities. We set out his full report as an Appendix, and this includes recommendations to ESBC to follow up detailed analysis with the appropriate bodies. For the sake of brevity, we highlight his main conclusions below:-

- This report states that *“This FRA concludes that the proposed development will not lead to the impedance of flood flows and will not increase the risk of flooding on the site itself, adjacent properties or to third parties situated either upstream or downstream of the site.”* but the content and limitations of the assessment’s coverage demonstrate the opposite;
- Severn Trent Water’s response to the applicants’ enquiry states that due to existing surcharge and flooding of the foul/combined sewer network within Barton there is insufficient capacity to accept foul flows from this development. For surface water there is not sufficient capacity to accommodate the flows from the development;
- The proposed surface water drainage strategy will not work and would also discharge surface water into a combined sewer in The Green;
- The proposed foul water strategy confirms that not all of the development can be drained by gravity to the public sewer and that pumping will be required. No land for a pumping station is allocated.

3.30 The main conclusion that we derive is that it is unlikely that the site can be developed in the short term

Reptile Survey, Preliminary Ecological Assessment and Biological Net Gain

3.31 The Applicants have submitted a Reptile Presence/Absence Report. The report detects the presence of the common lizard but no great crested newts. The Parish Council does not have the expertise to challenge the methodology or the expert’s claims. But the conclusion is surprising, as the District Licensing Scheme Map for East Staffordshire, shows that the site lies in a red impact zone which indicates a highly suitable habitat, which are important areas for great crested newts. It may be the case that as the survey was undertaken in April then this was a suboptimal time.

3.32 The report identifies the need for a reptile migration strategy including the translocation of reptiles whether within the development or offsite. No provision appears to have been made either on or offsite.

Summary and Conclusion

4.1 The site is not allocated in the Local Plan which makes provision for the housing needs of the village up to the end of the plan period in 2030. The site is also located outside the settlement boundary of the village and, therefore, is contrary to Policy SP 8 for development in the open countryside. Permitting a site of this size will also be contrary to the development strategy and the settlement hierarchy which directs development to the most sustainable locations.

4.2 We are well aware of the present Government's requirement to boost housing growth but believe that how much housing, and where it is located is best achieved through a review of the Local Plan. We believe that this approach would provide a far more rational and sustainable approach than the approval of ad hoc and opportunistic proposals.

4.3 We disagree with the applicants that Local Plan policies are out of date because of a lack of a five-year supply of housing. ESBC's latest calculations still conclude that there is a five-year supply, and that this also takes into account the additional Government's housing forecasts for the Borough. And even if the supply is reduced somewhat, we do not believe that the applicants have demonstrated why housing should be permitted in this village and on this particular site.

4.4 We regard the applicant's Housing Needs Survey as dealing with Borough wide issues and as lacking the justification for the particular housing needs in Barton.

4.5 We appreciate that the applicants have taken the time to produce a Design Statement which demonstrates how the housing might be accommodated. It puts forward some good ideas, but in the light of our experience on the Causer Road development off Efflinch Lane, we feel that ESBC need to undertake some preparatory groundwork. We request that ESBC protect the existing trees and hedgerows on the site.

4.6 We find it hard to give much credence to the results of the Transport Assessment. We may be wrong, of course, but it bears the analysis of a desk study rather than the reality of everyday life as experienced by the local community.

4.7 As Severn Trent Water has stated that the public sewer network is at capacity and, as we understand it, there is no budget provision being made over the next few years to upgrade the network then we can only conclude that the site must be undeliverable in the short term or indeed within the NPPF specified 5 year delivery period.

We, therefore, object to the application as being contrary to Policy SP 8 for development outside settlement boundaries, and Policies SP 2, 3 and 4 regarding housing provision in the Local Plan and the Settlement Hierarchy.

If ESBC is mindful to approve the proposal?

4.8 The applicants have been previously associated with the Causer Road development site, off Efflinch Lane, which was allocated in the Local Plan. The applicants acted as developers before selling the site on to a house builder. That experience has led us to believe that the situation, in terms of housing numbers, type and design layout may well be subject to considerable change. So, notwithstanding that this is an outline application, we would like to recommend that, if ESBC is mindful to approve, then they impose conditions on any decision which reflects the need for affordable housing to be in accordance with Policy SP 17 i.e. 40% should be affordable and that the type of affordable housing should be proscribed, with a preference for social housing rather than low-cost housing for sale. The developers have already indicated that there is a need for affordable housing and so we assume such a condition would be welcomed.

4.9 Policy SP 16 provides for an appropriate mix of housing types. We would also therefore advocate for a condition for housing types to be in accordance with Table 1 of the Housing Choice SPD March 2023 so that it can accord with Policy SP 16. Again, in view of the applicant's own survey results, we assume that this condition would also be supported.

4.10 As the Transport Assessment has indicated, 73% of traffic in Barton is by private car. This level of use of the private car does not meet sustainable transport objectives. We assume that the developers will want to promote a more sustainable form of development and, therefore, a condition should be attached to any approval, for a Travel Plan to be prepared, with the aim of reducing reliance on the car.

4.11 The Parish Council has been contacted by other Parish Councils, who feel that they may be in a similar situation. We therefore fear that if ESBC were to grant approval, then it could create a precedent for development in other rural locations.

Recommendation

That this report be submitted to East Staffordshire Borough Council as representing the Parish Council's comments on planning application P/2025/00513 for housing development on land off The Green. In particular, the Parish Council objects to the application as being contrary to Local Plan Policies SP 2,3,4 and 8

Appendix

A review of the Applicants' Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy document has been undertaken by Derek Lord C.ENG, MICE, MCIWEM, a drainage expert with significant experience of reviewing FRAs on behalf of Lead Local Flood Authorities.

Detailed comments

Following review by a qualified drainage expert, BPC considers that this report demonstrates that the development drainage is not sustainable and, if implemented, without offsite upgrading of downstream drainage infrastructure, would increase risk of flooding within Barton village.

Surface water

The applicant states that they do not believe the surface water drainage of the site can be drained by infiltration to ground. Based on local knowledge of the underlying strata, the presence of 3 ponds and 2 dry ditches. BPC agrees this is the case.

The applicant proposes to discharge surface water at attenuated flow rates from catchments A and B respectively to the 2 dry ditches. The applicant has shown no curiosity as to the nature, condition or capacity of the ditches downstream of the site and has simply assumed that their proposals will not cause any increased flood risk. BPC has undertaken site inspections and liaised with residents to establish details of the proposed receiving watercourses.

Catchment A is proposed to drain into the normally dry ditch at the western boundary. It can be confirmed that this ditch turns west and is within the boundary of 'Roseleigh'. It follows the boundary before passing under Bar Lane in a culvert. The condition and capacity of the culvert is not known but the resident confirms that Staffordshire County Council (SCC) has carried out repairs in the past and that during rainfall the ditch often overflows into the garden. SCC are currently investigating highway drainage problems on this section of Bar Lane which lead to regular flooding and ponding on the road in the area of the development access. There are also flooding problems at the next highway crossing of Dogshead Lane.

Catchment B is proposed to drain into a pipe at the boundary of the development with 60 The Green. Following inspection and liaison with the residents at 58 and 60 The Green, it can be confirmed that the route of the pipe is via a manhole pipe in 58 The Green to a manhole in 60, outfalling into the road. Since the land on the opposite side of the road is fully developed, there is no land drainage outfall, and it is apparent that the only receiving drainage infrastructure can be the public combined sewer.

The STW developer enquiry response states *"We are unable to permit any SW connections to the existing combined sewer as we do not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the SW flows from your development due to the existing flood and surcharge levels."* As a result, it appears that catchment B has no achievable gravity outfall.

The applicant suggests that if this is the case they would simply pump surface water from catchment B to catchment A. This would require both a pumping station and the attenuation storage. Transfer of flows from one natural catchment to another is not good practice and would need regulatory consent. It would result in significant additional storage requirements in order to protect against flooding in the event of pump failure and also to avoid exacerbating existing flood risk on the ditch receiving catchment A/B flows.

Sizing of the attenuation basins for both catchments is based on an assessment of greenfield runoff, presented in Appendix J. Whilst the methodology is correct, the calculation appears to use a value of 1 Ha for the existing undeveloped catchment compared to 4.5 Ha stated in the application. This suggests that the greenfield runoff of the undeveloped site may be understated.

The drainage strategy states that the attenuation basins have a depth of 1.0 m. In accordance with sewer adoption standards the minimum depth of cover to the incoming pipes is 1.2 m, which would imply the basins are too shallow. It has also not been demonstrated that, given the flat nature of the site, that all areas will be capable of draining to the basins.

In addition, it can be seen from the topographic survey that the ditch's are very shallow, such that a 1 m deep basin will be deeper than the beds. This will prevent a gravity outfall.

In order to provide a gravity outfall, the basin would need to be shallower and thus would require a much greater plan area, also making it more difficult to connect the incoming surface water sewers by gravity.

BPC requests that ESBC request detailed guidance and advice from SCC Lead Local Flood Authority on the Appendix J calculations and the practicality of the attenuation basins.

Foul water

Catchment A is proposed to drain to the combined sewer in Bar Lane, not The Green, as stated. It is stated that not all properties will be able to drain by gravity into the drain and pumped connections will be required. This arrangement is not sustainable, and the properties will be at higher risk of flooding when the pumps fail, for example in a power cut.

In the case of catchment B, it is stated that a gravity connection will be made to the combined sewer in The Green. It is stated, however, that if due to levels this is not achievable and a pumping station will be required.

BPC note that no allowance has been shown in the layout drawing for any pumping stations.

The applicant makes assertions that ESBC should grant outline planning consent for this development and providing this is granted STW are under immediate duty to upgrade the public sewer network to accommodate the foul flows. This is at variance with both what is stated in the STW developer enquiry response and BPC's own understanding of STWs duty.

Given the clear STW statement that the existing capacity of the combined/foul water network is such that there already problems and flows from the development cannot be accommodated, BPC request that ESBC request a formal response from STW confirming their position on impact of development and timescale for delivery of improvements required to provided capacity for the development.

Barton under Needwood Parish Council

P/2025/00386

Malverna, Sich Lane, Woodhouses, Yoxall: erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension to facilitate the change of use of a dwelling to a children's care home for up to 3 children

Additional Parish Council Comments

A planning application, with this reference, was submitted earlier this year for the conversion of "Malverna" to a children's care home. The Parish Council commented on this proposal objecting on the basis of it being contrary to Policy SP 8 for development outside settlement boundaries, Policy SP14 the Rural Economy and Policy DP 7 Pollution and Contamination. We had been approached by local residents, who described a number of issues of concern regarding the recent permission given to the adjoining Yew Tree House. We were informed that the use of this property as a care home had resulted in more vehicles and staff arriving and using the premises than originally envisaged. This apparently resulted in parking and traffic hazards. The Parish Council felt, therefore, that the combined properties may result in noise and disturbance which might be detrimental and material to the peaceful enjoyment of neighbouring properties.

This amended proposal relates to a series of single storey extensions to Malverna, which, as the description now states, is to facilitate the conversion into a care home. It should be noted that these proposals largely reflect a permission given in 2023 under P/2023/00762.

The Parish Council wishes to maintain and reiterate its objection to the original scheme for the change of use to a care home. In addition, however, in the light of this amended proposal for a substantial overall extension of the property we also wish to object on the grounds that it is contrary to Policy DP 3 Design of new residential development, extensions and curtilage buildings. This policy states that, for extensions to existing dwellings outside settlement boundaries, they should be modest or necessary to improve a substandard dwelling. No information or evidence has been provided by the applicants that the building is substandard.

The Local Plan does not qualify what it means by "modest". This proposal appears to substantially increase the size of the existing property and, therefore, we cannot see that it can be regarded as modest. The Oxford English Dictionary states that modest means, "moderate or restrained in amount, extent, severity not excessive or exaggerated". We, therefore, also object to the proposal as being contrary to Policy DP 3.

If ESBC is mindful to approve this proposal we would like to recommend that the area for parking be paved with a permeable material.

Barton under Needwood Parish Council

Statement of Community Involvement Draft for Consultation July 2025

The Parish Council has been consulted on this document from the Planning Policy team at the Borough Council. Comments are requested by 23rd August 2025. When adopted, this document will supersede an earlier version dated 2020.

The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is a statutory planning document. It sets out how ESBC, as the Local Planning Authority, will go about involving local communities and a wide range of other groups and bodies in the preparation of the Local Plan and other documents. It sets out how the Council intends to engage with people in the determination of planning applications. It also sets out how it will support communities in preparing neighbourhood plans.

Parish Council Comments

Local Plan

The production of the SCI at this stage is timely, bearing in mind the Borough Council's intention to review the Local Plan. Preparation of the Local Plan is heavily prescribed. It has to follow certain stages at which consultation is necessary. This includes evidence gathering, a draft plan, and a proposed submitted version. Following these stages of consultation, a version of the Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State and a Planning Inspector is appointed to consider formal objections at an Examination in Public. Following the preparation of the Inspector's Report, Modifications are then advertised and consulted on before ESBC adopts the final version and the Local Plan becomes a statutory document. Most consultation takes place for a period of 6 weeks.

Whilst the SCI is fairly comprehensive in setting out the stages and the likely groups and people it will consult, it is not so apparent in addressing the how, i.e. what media it will use to consult. Para 4.19 sets out a menu of the types of methods it will use, and the Council is well aware of the need to engage with under-represented and difficult to reach groups. This is a difficult one for the Council as it will need to use different methods for different documents, but we feel it would be helpful if the SCI set out in more detail how it will attempt to engage with these groups. There is not much in the document about the use of how social media can be harnessed. At the early stages in the Local Plan process, before it reaches the statutory stages, however, there can be greater flexibility and hopefully, an opportunity to be more creative in how ESBC engages. And it is precisely at these stages that ESBC needs to understand the problems, needs and desires, that local communities and groups face, so that these can be addressed in developing appropriate policies.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

These documents (SPDs) are prepared as a means of explaining and amplifying in more detail how particular planning policies will operate. They provide additional guidance, but

they are also there to supplement and not replace the actual local plan policy. SPDs can also be prepared to provide guidance for a specific development site.

The Parish Council has commented on various SPDs in the past and our comments here really relate to these past experiences.

We feel that there is a need for more consistency both in the way SPDs are prepared and consulted on and how the associated documents are available for view. One example of what we mean was the preparation of the St George's Park SPD. We understand that this document was prepared by consultants appointed by the Football Association and not the Planning Policy team. As a result, there was some consultation undertaken but from what we can gather this consisted of groups and organisations being invited to a day long exhibition at St George's Park. Groups were asked to provide feedback then and there. As a Parish Council, we attended the exhibition but felt that we needed more time to consider the document and had been anticipating to be formally consulted and being given a period of time to respond. This never happened. The next thing we were aware of was the approval of the document at a Cabinet meeting. We were very surprised and disappointed that an SPD could have been approved without undertaking the more conventional consultation process. The process used in preparing St George's Park was certainly contrary to the approach set out in the SCI. That approach should never have been allowed, and we can only hope, that in the future, ESBC follows the consultation stages as set out in the SCI.

We have always been disappointed that the supporting documents associated with the SPD are never accumulated in one place on the Council's website. As an example, the Parish Council made some detailed comments on the most recent Housing Choice SPD. We had thought that the report of consultation setting out the responses groups and organisations had made, and how ESBC had responded would be available to view under the SPDs listed in the Planning Policy section of the website. But no. If we wanted to discover whether ESBC had taken account of our comments, and if not, why not, then we had to search the Committee section of the website to find, by trial and error, the particular Cabinet meeting that had considered the draft SPD and the report of consultation. This is just not good enough. Surely, for each SPD it should be possible to see the draft SPD, a list of the comments made by groups or individual and ESBC's response, together with a report setting out what changes were proposed to the SPD and why, as a result of the consultation exercise. This section should also include any formal adoption statement together with the revised and adopted version of the SPD. In that way the public should be able to see, in a transparent way, the process SPDs have gone through to get to an adopted version of the document. All SPDs should be treated in this way so there is an element of consistency, transparency and accountability in the process. We should not have to go searching all over the ESBC website to find the appropriate documents and reports.

Parish Councils meet every month, but the time allowed for consultation on SPDs is only 4 weeks. Inevitably it will happen that Parish Council meeting dates fall foul of deadlines for comments. Can we therefore suggest that ESBC adopt a 6 week consultation timescale for SPDs instead?

Planning Application process

We have recently been considering a proposal for a major housing development in the village. We are also aware that Government policy is to promote economic growth by boosting the amount of housing over the next five years. As a result, we feel that an essential factor will be the capacity of local services to provide for this additional growth. We, therefore, feel it is absolutely critical that all the usual relevant bodies, statutory undertakers, and other providers of services to the community are consulted at an early stage in the Local Plan process and also in the determination of planning applications. Please make the consultation as wide as practically possible because capacity will be such an important issue for local communities. This will be essential, as in the case of upgrades to local sewage treatment works, as an example. The relevant bodies need as much advance notice as possible so as to make budgetary provision in their operational programmes.



Attendees: Councillors Sally Bedford (Chair of Committee) (SB), Ed Sharkey (ES), Margaret Hassall (MH), Jo Sellers (JS), Susie Millar (SM) & Siobhan Rumsby (SR) – Parish Clerk

1. Attendance and apologies

Councillor Bedford welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the PEC Committee. There were apologies from Cllr Lord.

2. Minutes from the meeting held on 3rd June 2025

The minutes were approved.

3. Election of Chair

Cllr Bedford was unanimously elected as Chair, proposed by Cllr Sharkey and seconded by Cllr Sellers. There were no other nominations.

4. Terms of Reference

The terms of reference were approved. SB advised we would review these again during the year.

5. Purpose of the Committee

ES went through the purpose of the Committee as set out in the terms of reference.

6. Action Plan areas

SB and ES explained how the action plan had been developed following the survey. Discussion was held around the areas identified for the PEC Committee.

SR to provide actions from Police, Crime and Fire Commissioner meeting for the next meeting – Action 11.

SR to share Police Plan for the next meeting (ES to provide link) – Action 12.

ES to contact Dick Titley about his Barton Crimewatch FB group so that Susie Miller can share social media regarding police and crime on relevant sites. Also ES to advise DT of Jo Seller's interest in the group as a village business owner - Action 13.

7. Risk Assessment

The full Council risk assessment had been shared to inform members that a risk assessment was necessary for each event we arranged. MH advised this was also best practice in Education. Existing risk assessments for specific events to be reviewed nearer the time.

8. Events diary

1. Police, Crime & Fire Commissioner meeting with the public 20th March 2025

PEC to follow up the actions agreed.

2. VE Day 4th May was a very successful event for the village.

A 'lessons learnt' needs to be compiled to inform future events. SB to link in with Sue Van Daesdonk – Secretary of the local RBL Branch.

3. **VJ Day Friday 15th August.** This will be for attendance only as organised by RBL (no road closure required). 11.45am Laying of a Wreath at the War Memorial, 2 minutes silence at noon. PC representation so far – MH has confirmed she can attend.
4. **Teddy Festival Saturday 30th & Sunday 31st August** – organised by Festival Committee, traditionally some Councillors have taken part in helping.

Members were asked to help source volunteers to help on the day.

5. **Remembrance Parade, Sunday 9 November 2025.** Organised by RBL – BPC assist with ordering the Road Closure Notice and providing marshals for the parade under BPC insurance as RBL will not provide cover, Cllr Lindy Young has been involved with the knitted poppies decorations; we risk assess the event as it is covered by our insurance.

SB to link in with Sue Van Daesdonk, Secretary to RBL and organise a meeting in September with ES, herself and the RBL.

Siobhan advised she had already submitted a road closure application.

6. **Christmas Lights Switch On** - organised by BPC:-

- Provisional date to be Saturday 29 November—ES to confirm with Rev Andy Simpson and SB to confirm with Neil Munro at the Shoulder of Mutton. Tree to be erected week beginning 22 November.
- SR to request the Road Closure once the date is confirmed.
- JS to ask Mercer Charitable Foundation (MCF) if they could provide a 15' tree again. If they agree ES to write to MCF as confirmation and to thank them

PEC to liaise with MCF on the donation of a tree, erect and decorate tree, (Saturday before event);

PEC to liaise with Shoulder of Mutton re electrics

PEC to Identify marshals for the event

- MH to liaise with TRIS and TRIJ to make decorations in the form of Christmas wishes from the primary schools
- PEC to liaise with St James' Church and Fire Service re: erection and electrics for the Church Star (which belongs to us);

- PEC to invite Rev Andy to lead carols
 - PEC to arrange any other 'stalls' if needed;
 - ES contacted Stephen Taylor to arrange attendance of Bartones Choir, Mr Emery at TRJS re pupil participation, and/or JTHS band for carols;.
 - PEC to arrangeFather Christmas has traditionally switched on the lights and then appears in grotto in the Shoulder after (the latter being Shoulder's responsibility/risk). ES to contact Gerry Cannell to find out if he is interested in doing this again.
 - PEC to arrange Working Party to dismantle everything in New Year.
 - SB and PEC Committee to Risk Assess everything.

(Where PEC is listed as action owner, at the next meeting we will identify volunteers for these roles from the Committee)

7. Further discussion was held about organising a **Music Festival** in 2026. JS had been speaking to a potential sponsor who was very keen to have the festival and to be co-opted for a working party to arrange this. JS to follow up.
8. MH suggested resurrecting Open Gardens with competitions for children to 'find the Barton bunny'.

9. **Barton Business Community (BBC)** –JS to arrange 3 meetings per year with guest speakers; initially for businesses on high street and Marina. Discussion about how to further grow the numbers and involve small businesses run from home.

10. Social media

Susie and Siobhan to meet to agree how to make the best use of social media and links to the web-site.

Cllr Sharkey shared links to the WhatsApp groups 'Barton and Surrounding Crime Watch' and the 'Barton Brook Flood Group' with Cllr Sellers and Susie.

11. Policies

The policy spreadsheet was shared. Currently these are up to date, but we will need to review each policy before the end of the financial year.

12. Budget for 2025/26 and planning budget for 2026/27

The budget for this financial year is £3500, of which £847 has already been spent.

By December we will need to develop our budget for 2026/27. If we do have a music festival and it is run independently the organisers can apply for a grant from the Barton and Dunstall Key Trust.

13. Civility and Respect Pledge

This item was included to make PEC aware that as a Council we have signed up the Civility and Respect Pledge.

14. Any other business

JS highlighted a number of issues her clients had raised with her.


- Barber's signage on Main St. The owner had agreed verbally to change the signage. Cllr Sharkey advised it should be a traditional sign in keeping with the village, e.g. change existing 'Fat Cat' sign on gable end of property and use a small 'hanging' sign on the front elevation similar to other nearby businesses.
- Signage at the cycle shop was also complained about.
- Blocked drains
- Speeding through the village
- Trees near the benches outside the church looked scruffy
- Mobile phone signal. SR said this is now being looked at by BT Open Reach
- Keeping female run businesses safe. The Beauty Boutique had been targeted at night by 4 youths. JS was given Dick Titley's phone number and also advised to speak to PCSO.

15. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Monday 15th September at the Village Hall.

SB advised she would be in Australia from 9th August to the 5th September.

MH advised she will be away for 4 weeks from the third week in September.

Barton under Needwood Parish Council	
	<p>Clerk to the Council: Siobhan Rumsby Parish Council Office Village Hall Crowberry Lane Barton-under-Needwood Burton upon Trent DE13 8AF 01283 716059 clerk@bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk www.bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk</p>
Policy, Events & Communication (PEC) Committee	
Terms of Reference - July 2025	

Introduction

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

Purpose of Committee

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

- To create a two-way communication flow with parishioners and other stakeholders, using a variety of mediums in consultation with the Parish Clerk.
- To engage parishioners and stakeholders to encourage their participation in decision making and create an active and informed community.
- To ensure communications are effective and proportionate to their purpose.
- 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 wellbeing of parishioners and to work in collaboration with other organisations, charities or groups.
- To ensure that all policies and procedures are reviewed and updated in line with the National Association of Local councils (NALC) model policies and procedures.

Terms of Reference

Specific responsibilities of the Committee will be:

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

- To ensure any formal consultations are fit for purpose.
- To develop and update policies as required in line with NALC model policies and procedures.
- With regard to risks associated with policy, events and communications, the PEC Committee shall, on behalf of the Parish Council:
 - Own and manage any risks arising from policy, events and communications as recorded in the Parish Council's General Risk Assessment Document
 - Identify and manage mitigating actions relating to the policy, events and communications risks recorded in the General Risk Assessment Document

Delegated Authority

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

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

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

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.

Frequency of Meetings: The committee shall meet quarterly. Additional meetings maybe added for arrangements relating to events.

Membership: To be drawn from members of the Council and consist of 5 members.

Quorum: Three members.

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

External Attendees: External members may be co-opted as required.

Public Participation: Meetings will be open to the public.

Working Parties: May be set up for specific time-limited tasks as required.

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

Human Resources Committee Terms of Reference

Updated July 2025

Introduction

This Terms of Reference sets out the purpose of the Human Resources Committee and how it will operate

Purpose of Committee

The Committee will make recommendations to full Council on all matters relating to Human Resources and ensure the Parish Council is compliant with Employment Law.

Membership

The Committee shall consist of up to five Councillors but a minimum of 3 members, as agreed and minuted in a Barton under Needwood full Council meeting. The Clerk will attend meetings.

Frequency of Meetings

The Committee shall meet as often as required and meetings can be at the request of full Council, the Clerk or the Committee. A quorum at each meeting shall be 3 members.

Record of Meetings

The Committee shall ensure that an agreed written record of each of their meetings is forwarded to full Council for the next normal meeting.

Attendance

It is expected that, where possible, 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: Due to GDPR, Human Resources Committee meetings are not open to the public.

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

Functions of the Committee

- To decide upon the arrangements for the appointment and appraisal of staff.
- To review and update where necessary the contract of employment and job description for any staff role, prior to any new appointment, and at least one every five years even if there is no new appointment required.
- To discuss and agree the process for any new appointment, including job description, shortlisting criteria and interview dates. Normally all correspondence with candidates and referees should be by the Clerk, but in the Clerk's absence this should be by a member of the Committee who has been appointed to that role by full Council. To recommend to full Council, after interview and due consideration, suitable candidates for appointment. Decision on appointment is made by full Council.
- To ensure all staff appraisals are carried out annually and reported to the next full meeting and to carry out an annual appraisal of the Clerk.
- To consider and implement remuneration levels for staff, including any changes to pay grades, in line with government announcements if required. To make recommendations to full Council for approval where there are financial implications. Any nationally agreed annual increase as announced by Society Local Council Clerks/National Association of Local Councils will be automatically awarded to the Clerk.
- To determine the approach required regarding any issues/grievances arising from the public or Councillors relating to individual Councillors. Where such issues require referral to the Monitoring Officer these will be agreed by the full Council.
- With regard to risks associated with human resources , the HR Committee shall, on behalf of the Parish Council:
 - Own and manage the any risks arising from HR as recorded in the Parish Council's General Risk Assessment Document
 - Identify and manage mitigating actions relating to the HR risks recorded in the General Risk Assessment Document
- To deal with any matters that are raised under Barton under Needwood Parish Council's own specific policies and any applicable national legislation such as grievance, health and safety as it applies to staff, any Code of Conduct matters that apply to staff, any staffing disputes, or other staffing related issues.

- To develop and update HR and Health and Safety Policies as required.
- To carry out Health and Safety checks and Risk Assessments in accordance with policy.

DRAFT

CORRESPONDENCE & COMMUNICATIONS

GENERAL

1. Copy neighbours' correspondence to ESBC planning regarding Rhosyn Farm – (*cc'd Planning Committee*)
2. Resident advising of land overgrowing shared driveway and the highway – *Chairman Responded*
3. Resident concerns regarding flood alleviation works Efflinch Lane – *Cllr Lord responded*
4. Resident report of damage to Oak tree Gilmour Lane – D. Boulter made safe
5. Resident copy objections to The Green development x 63 (*cc'd Planning Committee*)
6. Resident report of drug related activity at Mill Lane – *PCSOs responded*
7. Resident comments on Malverna planning application. (*cc'd Planning Committee*)
8. Request from MP's office regarding parking restrictions on Main Street opposite the Co-op – *Clerk responded, SCC matter*
9. Resident request for missing goal posts to be replaced in Collinson Park

ESBC

10. Planning Policy Statement of Community Involvement – Consultation 10/7 to 21/8/25

SPCA/NALC

11. Newsletters and training opportunities- forwarded to all Cllrs; Flood Resilience Survey (deadline 29 August 25)