

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	245.00	1,715.00		
Interest	20.48	23.87	499.81	23.38	21.23	477.13	22.43	27.00	473.07	369.38	12.64	7.92	1,978.34		
ESBC	41,146.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41,146.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	82,292.25		
LA Other	932.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	932.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,865.00		
Burial Ground	2,235.00	185.00	3,060.00	1,950.00	480.00	1,545.00	885.00	3,080.00	1,440.00	715.00	300.00	1,865.00	17,740.00	16,000	1,740
Fishpond	409.00	260.00	130.00	228.00	316.00	0.00	400.00	0.00	0.00	200.00	0.00	92.00	2,035.00	2,500	-465
VAT	0.00	0.00	11,143.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,542.66	18,685.82		
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	67.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	187.98	0.00	0.00	464.26		
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	15,035.15	2,201.38	817.23	44,168.05	1,307.43	3,107.00	1,913.07	1,472.36	312.64	9,752.58	135,147.75		

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	18.75	10.20	31.41	0.00	15.35	19.55	0.00	9.35	166.24		
Salaries	3,682.12	3,806.67	3,464.72	3,806.67	3,807.38	3,521.80	3,869.51	3,521.60	3,802.25	3,863.75	3,521.80	3,433.91	44,102.18		
Lengthsmen	195.40	259.38	195.40	244.46	195.40	195.40	244.46	195.40	275.40	244.46	195.40	195.40	2,635.96		
HMRC	0.00	967.25	1,556.57	1,294.44	2,345.34	1,510.89	1,330.55	1,482.89	1,304.76	1,477.55	2,507.94	1,330.55	17,108.73		
Nest Pensions	183.28	0.00	183.28	183.28	183.28	407.70	0.00	189.16	388.82	0.00	189.16	189.16	2,097.12		
Admin	1,660.47	1,976.74	1,464.68	854.10	107.99	808.77	1,322.94	159.45	1,863.71	446.29	0.00	268.87	10,934.01		
Donations	0.00	132.50	25.00	40.00	130.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	457.50		
Parks	13,370.37	405.97	2,398.45	1,479.79	1,207.85	1,346.65	1,507.85	1,207.85	30.00	30.00	0.00	69.25	23,054.03	24,213.00	1,158.97
Burial Ground	20.00	0.00	0.00	366.66	149.65	789.03	0.00	183.33	0.00	408.95	328.05	380.85	2,626.52	5,000.00	2,373.48
Allotments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	95.77	0.00	0.00	1,461.67	0.00	0.00	76.57	0.00	1,634.01	2,152.00	517.99
Fishpond	425.24	0.00	297.28	394.34	127.00	1,220.75	98.00	214.70	523.99	98.00	339.39	304.17	4,042.86	3,350.00	-692.86
Capital Exp	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		
Maintenance	0.00	32.21	69.21	60.84	78.82	0.00	91.36	97.86	1,265.00	1,791.59	0.00	20.00	3,506.89		
Car Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,161.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,161.65		
General payments	360.00	2,690.08	0.00	19.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	65.00	0.00	0.00	3,154.38		
Projects	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		
PEC	179.99	100.00	0.00	567.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.47	253.33	235.70	0.00	0.00	1,356.87	3,500.00	2,143.13
VAT	2,860.26	1,036.07	548.75	436.07	256.59	683.16	319.59	335.61	375.78	524.30	53.64	175.54	7,605.36		
Total Spend	22,945.63	16,399.12	10,203.34	9,766.21	8,703.82	11,656.00	8,815.67	9,089.99	10,178.39	9,255.14	7,211.95	6,377.05	130,602.31		

Barton under Needwood Parish Council -

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

02/04/2026

		£	£	£	Allocation
Payee	Description	Value Gross	VAT	NET	
Salaries total		3,717.20		3,717.20	HR
Nest Pension Scheme		189.16		189.16	HR
HMRC		1,330.55		1,330.55	HR
Lloyds	Bank Charges	9.35		13.35	Admin
Sky mobile	mobile phone and CCTV data	44.00		44.00	Admin & CA&E
G A Cannell Memorials	Memorial plaque	457.02	76.17	380.85	CA&E
Burton Skip Hire	Skip Burial Ground	365.00	60.83	304.17	CA&E (Fishpond)
Barton Village Hall	Hall hire	11.25		11.25	Admin
SPCA	Membership incl NALC	837.29		837.29	Admin
AJS Fiseries Ltd	Barley Straw Extract	60.00		60.00	CA&E (Fishpond)
ESBC	Business Rates Burial Ground	309.40	- Rate relief	0.00	CA&E (BG)
BT	Landline & Broadband	210.26	38.54	171.72	Admin
Country Services	Equipment supplies	37.42	6.23	31.19	CA&E
BVH	Hall hire	306.38		306.38	Admin
SPCA	Cllr Induction	48.00	8.00	40.00	Admin T&D
			Total	7,437.10	

Notifications

Electricity - Fishpond Pump (SSE)

Previous (October)

New

Change in Rate

Standing Charge

291.98 p/per day

400 p/per day

Day Rate

38.38 p/kWh

36.241622 p/kWh

Night Rate

31.43 p/kWh

32.311801 p/kWh

Signed:

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

31-Mar-26

Lloyds Business Account	£	2,001.00
Lloyds Commercial Instant Access Saver	£	21,293.11
Unity Trust Bank Instant Access Saver	£	82,546.40
National Savings	£	35,540.95

Total Bank Balances**£ 141,381.46**Add Credits not on Statement£0.00 **£ 141,381.46**Less unpresented payments:-£0.00 **£ 141,381.46****Opening Balances :-****Bank Statements as at 31st March 2025**

Lloyds Current A/C	£	2,000.00
Lloyds Deposit A/C	£	18,771.11
National Savings	£	81,156.32
Petty Cash	£	35,189.06

Parish Council -

Total £ 137,116.49*Add Receipts to date* £ 135,217.75*Less Expenditure to date* £ 130,952.78

Total Cash and Investments as at -

£ 141,381.46**Difference** -£ 0.00RFO. S. Rumsby

MINUTES OF BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING OF Planning Committee



16 March 2026 – 6.30 pm; Small Meeting Room, Barton
Village Hall

Present: Cllrs E Sharkey (ES); D Lord (DL); M Hassall (CD)

Apologies: Roger Bell

Declarations of Interest: None

P/2026/00202 69 Causer Road: Erection of a single storey front extension and erection of storm porch

The proposal removes two existing bay windows on the front elevation and replaces them with 'full height', 6-pane glazed, white uPVC units which are brought forward by half a metre from the existing building façade. It's not known if these are sealed units or if any of the panes are opening lights.

A storm porch with a new front door spans the space between the two new windows, extending the hall area by incorporating the recessed area in front of the existing front door.

A tiled canopy spans the new windows with a double pitch to the new porch.

The full height windows substantially change the appearance of the property and change the local character of the built development. The Committee considered whether the proposal satisfied the requirements of ESBC Local Plan Policy DP3 on design of extensions and felt that in this particular location, where the property is at the very end of a cul-de-sac on a private drive, then the change to the elevation was acceptable.

However the Committee had concerns that if the proposal was located elsewhere on the main part of Causer Road extending from the junction on Efflinch Lane then it would stand out as noticeably different from the other properties on the road and potentially adversely affect the local street scene.

So in this instance the Committee would make **no objection** to the proposal but would wish to register concern should proposals for marked changes in the fenestration of the front elevations of buildings elsewhere on the estate if they were in more prominent locations where they might adversely affect the local character of the built development.

Resolved: No Objections

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.

Cllr Lord reported on his examination of the additional information submitted by the applicant; specifically a revised Transport Assessment and reports on Flood Risk Assessment and proposed

Surface Water drainage from the site, as well as responses to the Lead Local Flood Authority's comments on the application.

Cllr Lord is completing his comments and will circulate to all Parish Councillors in the next day or two.

Transport: It was felt that the Consultant's assessment has been prepared very much as a desk exercise and their assessment of the traffic patterns on the local roads, particularly at peak hour a.m. and p.m., and their expectations should the development be approved, do not match the lived experience of residents on Dogshead Lane, Bar Lane, The Green and Wales Lane who already experience vehicles speeding and ignoring road signage and road markings when 'rat running' to and from the A38 Catholme junction.

The Committee believes that these problems are likely to get worse should the housing development be permitted and no mitigation of this impact is being offered by the applicant.

The proposed location for an access to the development onto Bar Lane is too close to the existing Dogshead Lane junction and does not meet Highways standards.

Surface Water drainage: The site essentially splits into two halves with the eastern half thought to drain between properties at Walcott Grange, 54 The Green and 60 The Green and into road drainage or combined sewer on The Green. The applicant's consultant has carried out survey work that reveals that the drainage is in pipes of varied diameter ranging from 275mm dia. down to 100mm dia and that these become blocked with debris. No dye test was carried out to confirm where such site drainage ends up but it is felt to be highly likely that it drains in to the Severn Trent combined sewer in the roadway on The Green and is already likely to be contributing to surcharging of the sewer system downstream.

No proposal is being made to improve this drainage route or contribute to any improvement to the local sewer system.

The drainage route from the western part of the site runs in open channel behind housing on Bar Lane and then under Bar Lane in a shallow laid 150mm pipe before reverting to open channel ditch to link to the head of the drainage channel that feeds into the Full Brook on the south side of Dogshead Lane

Having discussed the existing drainage with Staffs CC County Highways and Staffs CC Flood Officer Cllr Lord does not think that the levels on site and along the drainage route off site would actually allow the site to discharge to the Full Brook. This is likely to result in increased flood risk to properties on Bar Lane.

The Committee does not believe that the additional information submitted by the applicant answers the questions posed by the Parish Council in its original objection submitted in July 2025 and recommends that the Parish Council request ESBC to note the comments in this note and that ESBC continue to have regard to the Parish Council's comments in that original objection.

Date of Next Meeting: Monday 30th March 2026

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

Barton under Needwood Parish Council Response to Additional Information provided by Providence Land

Synopsis

This synopsis is provided to summarise the position of BUNPC, following review of documents submitted in response to requests made by Staffordshire County Council as a statutory consultee. It is regrettable that the applicant has ignored the previous comments by BUNPC which remain valid and cast doubt on the sustainability and practicality of the development proposals.

The 3 new documents submitted have been reviewed by BUNPC and their technical experts. Their conclusions are set out in the detailed response below. In order to assist ESBC in their determination of the application a summary of BUNPCs evidenced objection is set out below.

ESBC has stated that it has a 5 year land supply and, on this basis, is not required to approve development proposals on sites not allocated in the Local Plan.

Even if the challenge made by the applicant regarding the land supply is correct, this doesn't create an open season on development. The Local Plan policies still apply in approving development and this includes defined settlement boundaries. The shortfall in land supply can and should be made up by approval of development in sustainable locations.

In the Transport Assessment, the applicant has effectively admitted that development would not be completed within 5 years. The STW Developer Enquiry response also indicates the likely need for improvement to the public sewer network prior to occupation of dwellings and these would be unlikely to be completed within 5 years. On this basis the 70 dwellings can't be included as contributing to the 5 year land supply.

Since the Transport Assessment Addendum has not taken account of BUNPCs comments which set out the assumption errors in traffic modelling, the Addendum conclusions remain inaccurate and the assertion that the traffic generated by 70

dwelling has no negative impact on Bar Lane, Dogshead Lane, The Green and Wales Lane is rejected.

Although SCC Highways Development Control has suggested the proposed site access appears to be acceptable, following technical assessment, BUNPC is advised that this is debatable. We will be discussing this with SCC to seek consensus.

Following review of the FRA DS Addendum, BUNPC does not agree with the conclusions that satisfactory drainage outfalls to acceptable receptors have been proven. BUNPC does not consider the information addresses the specific concerns raised by SCC LLFA.

The Drainage Strategy was previously reviewed for BUNPC by a drainage expert who has worked for both a number of LLFAs, developers and water companies with respect to planning application proposed drainage. They provided a detail explanation which identified why the Drainage Strategy will not work. The applicant has ignored this information and failed to refute it. BUNPC will be discussing this with SCC LLFA to seek consensus.

Purpose of this response to new information

Barton under Needwood Parish Council (BUNPC) has previously been consulted on the outline planning application for up to 70 dwellings on land to the north of The Green. This land is outside of the settlement boundary as defined in the East Staffordshire Borough Council (ESBC) Local Plan Inset 5 and thus not allocated for development.

BUNPC responded with detailed comments on the proposed development and the documents submitted in support of the application. In summary BUNPC confirmed objection to the proposal which is not compliant with Local Plan land allocation policy and would have adverse traffic, flood risk and ecological impacts.

Separately, as a statutory consultee, Staffordshire County Council (SCC) in its roles as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) issued comments and requests for further information. BUNPC understands that SCC has sought a holding objection to determination of the application pending the requested information.

Prior to the submission of the application, Severn Trent Water (STW) had provided the applicant with a Developer Enquiry Response, which was included as an appendix in the applicants submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.

With regard to foul water flows which would be generated by the development STW stated

“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.”

With regard to surface water flows which would be generated by the development STW stated

“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. You will need to explore the options of discharging the SW to the watercourse south of the site. Any discharge rate to a watercourse or drainage ditch will be determined by the LLFA / EA.”

STW repeated this position in their response to the planning application.

In response the applicant has submitted 3 documents

- Transport Assessment Addendum, The Green, Barton-under-Needwood dated 20 January 2026
- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, Revision B dated February 2026
- Additional Information in Response to LLFA comments dated 13 February 2026

These documents have been reviewed for BUNPC by suitably qualified and experienced engineers. The conclusions of these reviews are contained within this document.

BUNPC notes with regret that the applicant has not addressed the concerns we raised in respect of other issues such as ecological impact and lack of capacity in local services such as health care and schools.

BUNPC Response to the Transport Assessment Addendum

The addendum focuses on responses from National Highways (NH) and SCC to the original Transport Assessment. It ignores the comments and local knowledge provided by BUNPC. BUNPC made particular reference to the fact that the Assessment was a desk top exercise with assumptions that do not correspond with reality. This criticism equally applies to the Addendum.

NH response addressed?

With regards to NH the Addendum report is keen to focus on the NH statement that the assumed traffic generated by the 70 dwellings and traffic distribution assumptions set out within the original TA, are confirmed to be acceptable.

This is not surprising given the capacity of the A38. From a NH position it does not matter whether traffic joins the A38 at Catholme or Barton junctions.

BUNPC does not challenge the NH position. However, BUNPC and local residents who actually use local roads are very concerned as to the impact of traffic generation on roads between the development and the A38. This is in terms of actual rather than

theoretical generation and distribution of traffic on the various local roads between the development and the A38.

SCC Highways response addressed?

The main focus of SCCs response was on the assumptions regarding the distribution of traffic and split between Bar Lane to the west, The Green/Wales Lane to the east and Dogshead Lane towards the A38.

The consultant undertook modelling which distributed existing traffic and traffic generated by the 70 dwellings between these routes. SCC has taken the view that given the shortest route from the development to the A38 is via Dogshead Lane to Catholme junction, more vehicles will use this route in preference to The Green, Wales Lane and Main Street to Barton junction. However, at the same time, SCC also noted “concerns that Dogshead Lane being a narrow single carriageway road with a 60mph speed limit for the majority of its length is suitable to take that level of traffic from a safety point of view.”

SCC also noted that “The accident statistics section of the submitted TA excludes Dogshead Lane so there is no data relating to the accident record on Dogshead Lane.” They advised that there is a considerable amount of local concern regarding the impact of this traffic on Dogshead Lane

As a result, SCC recommended that the applicant be asked to carry out the remodelling of junctions with revised traffic flows and detailed consideration of Dogshead Lane.

Based on local knowledge and reality, BUNPC believes that whilst Dogshead Lane may provide the shortest route from The Green area to the A38, local people tend to avoid it for a number of reasons.

- For vehicles wanting to access the northbound A38 at Catholme there is no acceleration lane facility and the visibility of A38 oncoming traffic is poor.
- Dogshead Lane is a narrow single carriageway which does not have a uniform width and at some locations it is not possible for larger vehicles to pass in opposite directions. The consequence of this is that vehicles overrun the verge creating deep holes and damaging the edge of the carriageway.
- There are many bends which cause reduction in forward visibility
- In general, there are many potholes on Dogshead Lane.
- Dogshead Lane is subject to regular flooding at the location where the local watercourse (Full Brook) to which the applicant proposes to discharge surface water, crosses in a culvert of unknown size and condition.

BUNPC considers that rather than have an academic debate between the consultant Systra and SCC as to the relative distribution of traffic between Dogshead Lane and The Green/Wales Lane, given the desktop nature of the traffic distribution modelling, it is not

unreasonable to expect the consultant to model a range of distributions and identify worst case outcomes to inform the impact of development on the local road network and in particular each road.

BUNPC notes that none of the points raised in our response to the Transport Assessment have been addressed in the Addendum which remains a desktop assessment rendered inaccurate due to lack of onsite inspection. In response to SCCs concerns regarding Dogshead Lane and carriageway widths, the consultant has simply downloaded one or two Google Streetview images showing single cars. Their view that there isn't a problem may possibly have been given some validity if they had selected an image with showing a car passing a lorry without difficulty. BUNPC considers that this response does not address the concerns of either SCC or BUNPC.

BUNPC noted in our response to the Transport Assessment that assertions with regards to The Green and Wales Lane that "There are no parking restrictions and most properties fronting this corridor have off street parking" is factually incorrect. If the consultant can take Google Streetview images of Dogshead Lane to argue their case, there is no reason why they could not do likewise in The Green/Wales Lane. Images are available from 2009 to 2025 and all clearly show lines of parked cars along The Green and Wales Lane at a number of locations where older properties are located. In particular they show how the junction of Wales Lane with Main Street is adversely impacted.

BUNPC also considers that the impact of the lines of parked cars on traffic needs to be included in modelling of traffic flow.

BUNPC noted that the assumed peak travel time is incorrect and is actually earlier when the schools shut.

With regards to the site access proposals, in general highway authorities use Manual for Streets as a base document for assessing proposed development, both internal layout and site access. SCC has stated that the site access in Bar Lane appears to meet relevant standards in terms of layout and visibility. This view is not accepted by BUNPC for number of reasons set out below and previously identified in the response to the Transport Assessment.

The minimum width for a carriageway in accordance with Highways Act 1980 is 5 m. The actual carriageway width at the site access is 4.7 m. This has clear adverse consequences for vehicles seeking to turn in or out of the development. A large radius curve would be required in order to allow vehicles exiting the development towards The Green to do so without swinging across the road.

The distance between the centreline of the proposed site access and the centreline of Dogshead Lane measures at approximately 23 m. BUNPC has not found any specific minimum spacing distances for staggered junctions quoted by SCC in their guidance documents. However, for many other County Council highway authorities the typically quoted distance for staggered junctions on category C roads is 30 m.

The site entrance visibility splay to the west can only be achieved by removing the mature hedge that separates the narrow footpath from a pond. This is not acknowledged by the applicant and the means of protecting the public or errant vehicles from entering the pond have not been identified.

As previously advised both local residents and BUNPC are seriously concerned regarding the safety of the T junction of Dogshead Lane with Bar Lane and The Green. There have been a number of accidents at this junction including 4 accidents in which errant vehicles have crashed into and demolished the front wall of 76 The Green in the last 3 years. Theoretical visibility splays do not in reality exist due to parked cars outside houses that have no off road parking.

SCC is currently investigating this junction area and liaising with a local resident's action group.

As a general point regarding the Transport Assessment and Addendum reporting of accidents, BUNPC and SCC both noted that the TA only looked at The Green, Wales Lane and part of Bar Lane. There appeared be no logical reason why Dogshead Lane was excluded. The Addendum now covers Dogshead Lane but there is a discrepancy because accidents noted in the TA do not appear in the Addendum. One accident is now recorded at the junction of Dogshead Lane with Bar lane/The Green but we know there have been 4 in which a boundary wall has been demolished. We suspect that in total the accident records are underreporting.

BUNPC Summary

BUNPC continues to asset that neither the TA nor the TA Addendum, provide a reasonable accurate assessment enabling them to accept the claim that

“the evidence and data presented in this Transport Assessment Addendum provide assurance to the Local Highway Authority that the proposed development is not expected to result in undue safety risks, congestion, or excessive demands on local transport infrastructure”

BUNPC has previous practical experience with the Causer Road development of the variation between TA predicted limited impact of that development on local roads and the actuality. BUNPC asks ESBC to consider from pure common sense whether it is credible that traffic generated by 70 dwellings will have no adverse impact on Bar Lane and Dogshead Lane with their restricted widths and The Green/Wales Lane with the parked cars.

In order to help ESBC, in addition to submitting this response, BUNPC is going to provide separate photographic and video evidence that validate our concerns.

With regards to the SCC expressed view that “the site access in Bar Lane appears to meet relevant standards in terms of layout and visibility” BUNPC does not accept this and is going to take this up with SCC.

BUNPC Response to Additional Information in Response to LLFA comments

In response to the FRA and DS, SCC LLFA had concerns regarding outfall drainage assumptions which are expressed in requests for further information summarised as

- Existing condition of drainage ditches and whether any clearance is required
- Existing condition of piped outfall
- Downstream route and connectivity to an appropriate receptor

These mirror the comments raised by BUNPC.

The applicant has responded with limited answers based on the information contained in Appendix C. BUNPC does not accept the stated conclusions for the reasons set out in our response to Appendix C.

BUNPC Response to Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, Revision B

The purpose of Revision B is stated to be “Report updated to suit Client’s Comments”. This follows Revision A stated to be “Report updated to incorporate LLFA comments”. Unfortunately, and unhelpfully, any changes between the original FRA and revision B are not highlighted. This makes it difficult to identify any changed or additional information. However, it does appear that an additional Appendix has been added. This is Appendix C which becomes Drainage Survey. The original Appendix C changes to Appendix D etc.

BUNPC believes that the detailed technical comments it provided which demonstrated that the surface water drainage strategy described is not capable of either construction or will work as claimed. Even if the applicant could demonstrate that the attenuation basins and flow control can work, as demonstrated by their own submitted surveys, the outfall drainage is unsuitable so that there is not a viable downstream route and connectivity to an appropriate receptor as required by SCCLLFA.

Western Outfall

BUNPC notes that there is limited survey work undertaken in order to respond to the SCC LLFA queries. It is stated that “The western ditch route was traced from the site

boundary through Rosaleigh Cottage, Fairview Cottage, ultimately crossing The Green, which should actually be Bar Lane, and discharging into the downstream ditch network before reaching the main watercourse.” However, the only information is contained in drawing Topographic Survey Sheet 2 of 3.

This drawing shows details of the watercourse within Rosaleigh Cottage but not Fairview. A note states that there is a headwall inside the boundary of the Fairview private garden. From this BUNPC assumes that the survey company respected privacy and did not get consent to enter Fairview.

The owner of Rosaleigh Cottage had previously provided BUNPC with a detailed description of flooding from the watercourse and advised that they were concerned regarding adequacy of the culvert crossing at Bar Lane, which they said had been repaired a number of times in the past. Their comments are validated by reference to the EA Surface Water Flood Map. It seems unlikely that they would not have given the surveyor the same information.

The survey shows a 150 mm pipe on the downstream side of Bar Lane with a stated invert level of 61.52 mAOD and road level of 61.71 mAOD. If correct this would indicate no effective cover to the pipe. BUNPC notes that the SCC LLFA minimum approved road crossing culvert size is currently 450 mm.

In the case of the Eastern Outfall, all pipework was inspected by CCTV to establish size and condition. There is no explanation as to why, given there was access to the culvert outfall, it was not also inspected by CCTV.

In response to enquiries from BUNPC, SCC Highways confirm that they have no records of the size or condition of the culvert or any repairs made within the last 10 years.

Immediately downstream of the culvert there is a 375 mm pipe which crosses the field to discharge into an open channel. This has also not been inspected by CCTV.

BUNPC does not consider that the information now supplied answers the 3 key concerns raised by SCC LLFA. The full length of outfall from the development site to the open ditch to the south of Bar Lane has not been inspected. The condition of piped sections of 150 mm and 375 mm outfall has not been assessed. Although connectivity has been confirmed no assessment of the hydraulic capacity of the outfall, either ditch or pipe has been made. This is needed in order to determine water levels, both generally and at the point where the proposed attenuation basin discharges.

On the basis of current information BUNPC does not believe that the western outfall has been shown to be suitable for the development.

Although not a direct planning consideration BUNPC notes that neither the owners of Rosaleigh Cottage nor Fairview Cottage have consented to receive the post development modified flows to the sections of watercourse for which they are the riparian owner. Whilst riparian owners have a common law duty to accept discharges which arise from surface runoff on greenfield land, this does not apply to modified

runoff from constructed impermeable surfaces. If the drainage strategy submitted as part of the planning application is reliant on the consent of the downstream riparian owners and consent is not forthcoming, then the drainage strategy can't be delivered. Lack of an outfall is a planning consideration.

Eastern Piped Outfall

Following completion of a CCTV survey, the line and nature of the mostly piped outfall from the development site to a point adjacent to a highway gully outside 56 The Green has been established.

In response to the 3 SCCLLFA questions, on the basis of the survey, the applicant claims

“The surveyors confirmed that the water is not backing up in the system, indicating that a discharge route must be present. Downstream, the ditch connects into a 100mm piped system running through neighbouring gardens (including no. 56 and 60) before discharging into a highway gully, which ultimately connects in the highway drainage system on The Green. Although the final downstream connection could not be fully traced due to lack of access to buried highway infrastructure, the survey has confirmed that the eastern system does drain and has an existing functioning downstream route.”

and the piped outfall has

“been confirmed to discharge to appropriate downstream receptors” being “ the highway drainage network on The Green.”

BUNPC had previously sought to investigate the outfall by consulting with the owners of 54, 56 and 60 The Green. They confirmed the route to the manhole in the front garden of 60 and also commented on blockage/flooding issues.

The owners of 54 The Green confirmed that there is an open ditch running at the rear boundary of their property which is normally dry but floods in wet weather or if there is a downstream blockage. This has been inspected by BUNPC. At the time of visit after a period of heavy rain, the ditch was partially full and trickle of flow was entering the ditch. The incoming pipe appears to be the 275 mm MDPE pipe identified in the CCTV survey. As shown in the photo below, the pipe is heavily silted up.



At the downstream adjacent to the boundary with 56 The Green, the ditch outfall was drowned out and not visible, as shown in the photo below.



The owners of 56 The Green advised that the pipe which passes through their property was in place prior to their arrival. They have not had problems of flooding during rainfall but have had blockage problems with debris washed down and blocking at manhole B. They have had to clean out manhole B. Access to manhole A is problematic due to the shed.

The owners of 60 The Green also advised that the pipe which passes through their property was in place prior to their arrival. Other than knowing that the outfall pipe goes into the road, they had no knowledge of where it goes.

Whilst not challenging the data provided with the CCTV survey, BUNPC challenges to assumptions made regarding an outfall to a highway drain and the assertion that the system provides a suitable outfall.

The applicant states that water is not backing up in the system and it is true that this was the case at the time of CCTV survey which confirms no water in the ditch at the time of survey on a dry day. The FRA DS topographic survey also shows no recorded water levels in the ditch within the development site. The applicant has not provided evidence that water does not back up the system during rainfall events. The observations of the owners of 54 The Green, indicates that it does.

In order for the applicant to demonstrate that the outfall is suitable and has hydraulic capacity a full level survey of the downstream pipe is required together with hydraulic calculations.

In addition to concerns regarding the hydraulic capacity of the downstream pipe based on the CCTV survey results BUNPC does not consider that the length of outfall surveyed is serviceable or structurally sound. Even if this is the case the size of the pipe at 100 mm/150 mm diameter is so small as to create a high risk of blockage. Even the 275 mm pipe was blocked by a football. As previously noted, the SCC LLFA minimum approved watercourse culverting size is currently 450 mm.

The CCTV report provides details for each length of pipe surveyed together with a serviceability and structural score.

The first section of pipe running from the development site and through the garden of Walcott Grange is stated to be 275 mm and filled with silt up to 60% of depth at inlet and within the pipe. The pipe is partially blocked by a football. At a second attempt the CCTV survey continued past the football but failed to reach the outfall into the ditch in 54 The Green.

There is no CCTV survey between the ditch in 54 The Green and manhole B in the rear of 56 The Green therefore its size and condition is unknown.

The CCTV survey between manhole B and manhole 60 at the front of 60 The Green is confirmed to be 100 mm diameter but constructed in various pipe materials suggesting

an ad hoc construction. However, it is structurally sound and was mostly clear of silt/debris at the time of survey.

The CCTV survey downstream of manhole 60 is located beneath the public highway. This is a 150 mm clayware pipe in grade 4 structural condition. Grade 4 means that whilst not in imminent danger of collapse it requires replacement due to its advanced state of deterioration. The pipe is also in grade 3 serviceable condition indicating that cleansing is required.

The survey finished just short of gully 56 and the report states an assumption of discharge into that gully.

Gully 56 and its outfall are highway drainage assets owned and maintained by SCC Highways. This is a 150 mm clayware pipe in grade 3 serviceability and grade 1 structural condition. The survey terminated at a connection into a pipe in the road.

In addition, two other gully connections were surveyed but are not relevant to the development.

The gullies and their outfalls are shown in Topographic Survey Sheet 3 of 3. They are shown as discharging into a highway drain of unknown size which flows towards Dogshead Lane. The presence of this highway drain has not been proven.

BUNPC has liaised with SCC Highways who have confirmed that they have no records showing a highway drain in The Green. They believe that the highway drains which drain The Green discharge into the STW combined sewer.

BUNPC notes that the question of whether there is a separate highway drain could have been resolved at the time of survey by dye testing the gulleys and checking if the dye appeared in the combined sewer.

BUNPC considers that unless the applicant proves that the outfall from manhole 60/gully 56 is to the combined sewer, or identifies the ultimate outfall for the assumed highway drain, they have not answered the SCCLLFA query by demonstrating the “downstream route and connectivity to an appropriate receptor”

Eastern Piped Outfall Legal considerations

Irrespective of the condition and capacity of the piped outfall and whether it ultimately discharges to an appropriate receptor, BUNPC advises that in order for the pipe to be used as an outfall for the development surface water drainage, the applicant requires multiple consents for the use of the pipe. If such consents are not forthcoming a legal outfall does not exist and the Drainage Strategy can't be implemented.

If it is assumed that the piped outfall to The Green replaced an existing ditch, it remains a culverted watercourse and there is a right of discharge from the development land in

predevelopment greenfield state. This does not apply to flows arising from the development impermeable areas.

The applicant should be requested to provide evidence of consent to discharge from the downstream 4 property riparian owners.

Assuming such riparian owner consent can be obtained, the outfall is claimed to be highway gulley 56 and its outfall, owned by SCC Highways. There is no legal right of connection for non-highway drainage into a highway drain. Most Highway Authorities do not accept connection of non-highway flows and BUNPC is aware that this has been the historic position of SCC. The applicant should be requested to provide evidence of consent to discharge into highway gulley 56 and its outfall drain.

The question of the outfall for highway gulley 56 now arises. If SCC is correct the gulley 56 discharges into the STW combined sewer. There is no right of discharge for highway runoff or other surface water flows into a combined sewer. STW has confirmed in writing that surface water flows from the development can't discharge into the combined sewer. Therefore, the appropriate receptor required by SCC LLFA does not exist.

If the outfall is to a highway drainage outfall which is unknown to SCC, BUNPC understands that SCCLLFA will require evidence of its condition and point of outfall to confirm the appropriateness of the receptor. SCC Highways would also have to consent the flows into the highway drain.

Drainage Outfall Conclusion

Based on the additional survey work undertaken by the applicant to prove that suitable drainage outfalls exist, BUNPC has concluded that this is not the case. The applicant should be required to undertake further work as identified in this report.

In addition the applicant has not responded to the detailed comments previously raised by BUNPC which demonstrates that the Drainage Strategy, as described, can't be physically constructed.

MINUTES OF BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING OF Planning Committee



30 March 2026 – 5.00 pm; Small Meeting Room, Barton
Village Hall

Present: Cllrs E Sharkey (ES); D Lord (DL); M Hassall (CD), Charles Wallace (CW)

Apologies: Roger Bell

Declarations of Interest: None

P/2026/00260 35 Efflinch Lane: Erection of a single storey rear extension to 1930's detached property.

The proposal is for a modest approx. 7.0m x 3.5m extension off the existing Lounge to form a Dining Room with patio doors in to the garden area.

The roof of the extension is single pitch tiled extending to the cill level of the first floor windows with 4 no. roof lights. It's not shown whether these are opening lights or not.

The pitched roof design is much more in keeping with the character of the property than a flat roofed extension more commonly seen in planning applications for such extensions

The front elevation of the building is unchanged and the changes to the rear elevation re modest and unlikely to have a negative impact on the neighbouring properties or on the character of the local area.

Resolved: No Objections

Housing Needs Survey:

The Parish Council determined at its strategy meeting in February that putting in hand a Housing Needs Survey for the village was a priority in trying to influence the size and type of any housing allocation that might be made of the village in any revision of the ESBC Local Plan.

Also to provide evidence and inform any comments on any planning applications for housing made before the adoption of any revised Local Plan.

Cllr Sharkey had previously reported that Yoxall Parish Council were carrying out a Housing Needs Survey and had discussed the form of the proposed survey with Officers at East Staffs BC. ESBC had confirmed that the design of the survey, which included questions about Open Market an Affordable Housing, was suitable for ESBC to use in its own review of Housing

Need in the Borough as part of the Local Plan review and that this meant that it would have authoritative status if it were to be challenged by developers.

The lead Yoxall Councillor for the project, Bob Keys, had delivered a paper copy of the Survey to BPC Parish Clerk and Cllr Sharkey tabled copies of this for consideration by Planning Committee members. A scanned copy of the survey is attached to these notes.

Subject to more detailed consideration of the form and of any particular questions (e.g. that Barton had a significant population who were 'live-aboard' boat owners at Barton Marina) members considered that the Yoxall Survey was capable of being adapted with very few changes for use in a survey of Barton residents.

It was unanimously agreed that Cllr Sharkey should confirm with Yoxall PC that they were happy for Barton PC to adapt and use the format of the Yoxall Survey. Also to contact ESBC Planning and Housing Officers to discuss BPC issuing a survey and to agree what status that would have as supporting evidence for a revised Local Plan.

Finally Yoxall PC had been assisted by the 'Support Staffordshire' organisation in the production of the survey both in production and distribution costs and costs of providing postage-paid return envelopes and also by Support Staffordshire agreeing to independently collate the results of the survey.

Committee members agreed that Cllr Sharkey should also approach 'Support Staffordshire' for advice and to ask what support that might be able to provide for a survey in Barton.

Resolved: Parish Council members are asked to support the actions suggested above to advance the planning of a Barton Housing Needs Survey and the development of costings for such a survey.

Date of Next Meeting: Monday 30th March 2026

MINUTES OF BARTON UNDER NEEDWOOD PARISH COUNCIL
MEETING OF Community Assets and Environment Committee
(CAEC) 12 March 2026 – 6.30 pm; Small Meeting Room, Barton
Village Hall



Members Present:-

CLLr E Sharkey (Chairman)(ES); CLLr D Lord (DL); CLLr S Naylor (SN); CLLr C Davis (CD); CLLr H Frennd (HF);

Apologies: CLLr I Meadows (IM), Clerk to Council (Clerk)

Distribution: Those present plus IM and Clerk

The meeting was called by CLLr Sharkey with an intention to reconstitute the CAEC ,which has been unable to meet recently. The Agenda was followed as below:-

- 1 Attendance and apologies As listed above
It was suggested that Graham Hughes be invited to join CAEC. CLLr Lord will make contact with Mr Hughes. Action DL
- 2 Committee Chair
CLLr Sharkey nominated CLLr Davis as Chair of CAEC. Seconded by CLLr Naylor and approved by all attendees
- 3 Declarations of Interest - None declared
- 4 Urgent matters
4a Parks
a(i) The present contract is with JPS Landscapes (James Shorter and Charlotte Newstead). Currently paid in 7 instalments plus some daywork on trees (Ash Tree Rd.)
A renewal contract is to be issued. Action ES in 1 week
A new Tender invitation is to be issued for subsequent years . Action ES Time tba

a(ii) Supervision of Contract
In 2025 it was originally intended to get Dan Boulter to supervise the Contract; which he was prepared to do as a volunteer. However, his personal circumstances changed which meant he was then unable to do so. . It was suggested that consideration be given to asking Andrew Davies who is doing litter picking for the PC (who used to work for Lichfield DC parks/open space team), or that we advertise for a candidate based on a scope of work and an estimated number of hours a month.
Clerk to be asked to contact AD to see if he might be interested and for guidance on how to proceed
Action Clerk

a(iii)List of repairs
Annual Playdale/RoSPA inspection is usually around July, and is to be arranged. Action Clerk
CAEC to review last Playdale inspection report and prioritise a list of repairs or replacements needed.
Action Clerk

a(iv)) CAEC to develop a regular Equipment Inspection Record Sheet (weekly or monthly ?)
 Consider whether Andrew Davies might be interested in being trained to run that ? To be considered at a later stage
 Action tba

a(v) Replacement of benches and tables
 Original benches constructed from green oak by landscape contractor who built the park in 2010, with design being sympathetic to original 'natural' design aspirations. A discussion took place about timber or plastic legs, or 'off the peg' replacement benches with members favouring adapting the original green oak design.
 An enquiry to be sent to a sawmill operated by local woodsman Charlie Rayson (contact from Dan Boulter) as well as other sawmills who previously making bench kits and quoted prices are expected by 24 April. Action ES
 Review prices against alternative simple bench designs from other manufacturers.
 Decision needed on how many benches to repair or replace, by 29 April 2026 Action ES
 Proposal to be presented to full Council meeting on 07 May 2026 Action ES

4a(vi) Budget provisions
 Budget is felt to be adequate.
 Cllr Lord has been in long correspondence about grass reinstatement , and the contract payment for Collinson grass seeding, has not been finalised. Situation to be reviewed and Vernon Wright asked to update his quotation. Action ES/DL tba

4b Fishpond

b(i) Budget provisions are adequate

b(ii) Ticket prices were agreed to be increased for 2026 as follows(2025 price in brackets):-

	Adult	Retired	< 16 yrs	< 12 yrs
Day Ticket	£13 (£12)	£7 (6)	£6 (£6)	free (free)
Season Ticket	£48 (£45)	£28 (£25)	£25 (£25)	free (free)

Cllr Frend will approach Londis (Lax) to agree issue of tickets and to hold a list of ticket holders
 Action HF tba

b(iii) Fish Survey Environment Agency Survey report will be issued shortly (Apr/May) and will be distributed for review. Possibility of EA Grant is to be investigated.
 Action HF

b(iv) Potters Way

Quotation is required from tree surgeons, for Tree works
 Action ES tba

b(v) Liaison with EA (Jodie Hughes) to be maintained.
 Action HF/ES

b(vi) Electrical meter readings to be recorded monthly
 Action HF

4b(vii) Management plan status. Cllr Frend has a marked-up list showing completion status for Fishpond activities. List to be updated and circulated. Action HF

4c Allotments

c(i) Budget £2152 is for Lease and water costs. No increase to rents is necessary

c(ii) Trees/ Bonfires Hardy Close allotment boundary. Trees on Hardy Close side of boundary are on Highway land and owned by SCC. Adjacent allotment plot holder prunes any tree branches overhanging the boundary on his side as a 'common law' right. Resident / J Jessel (previous County Councillor) discussed with SCC Highways 2 or 3 years ago. Residents could ask ESBC for a Group TPO? Letter to be considered, to ask for permission for Parish Council to prune?

Action DL/Clerk

It seems clear that Allotment holders can burn material from their own allotment only, and on calm days when fire is under observation. Reminder letter to be issued Action DL/Clerk

c(iii) Dog Fouling. Cllr Lord will inspect the area and decide whether there is a problem. Action DL tba

4c(iv) Non-maintenance of plots. Graham Hughes advises Clerk and warnings may be issued. To be monitored and reviewed quarterly. Action DL

4d Burial Ground

d(i) Budget No change to Budget

d(ii) Memorial Green.

Garden Guild suggested changes to the Ashes area. To be reviewed in next meeting. Action CAEC

d(iii) Tree work. Review needed to define any necessary work Action ES

d(iv) Exceptions to Burial Ground rules - To be considered later. Clerk to be requested to prepare a list of exceptions which have been agreed or refused recently. Scope of this is to be agreed.

Action Clerk / ES

5 Terms of Reference

A draft update of Terms of Reference was tabled by Cllr Sharkey. Approved by all CAEC attendees, and is to be updated and issued Action ES

6 AOB No other Business

7 Date of next meeting

Wed 29 April 1830

Apologies from Cllr Davis due to Annual Leave. Interim Chair to be decided later

Meeting closed 20.30

CORRESPONDENCE & COMMUNICATIONS

GENERAL

1. Resident complaint about poor mobile phone signal in Barton – *Clerk responded*
2. Enquiry regarding transfer of grave ownership – *Clerk responded*
3. Allotment enquiries regarding boundary of plot – *circulated to CA&E*
4. Allotment enquiry requesting update on the purchase of a digital lock – *circulated to CA&E*
5. Allotment enquiry regarding pruning of trees – *Clerk responded*
6. Civic Society – request for Councillors to attend to provide a general brief on BPC matters. 12/6/26 – *forwarded to all Cllrs.*
7. Barton Library – request for Councillors to attend 50th Year celebrations 9/5/26, 11am-3pm – *forwarded to all Cllrs*
8. ESBC – Consultation on proposed changes to Housing Allocations Policy – deadline 23/4/26
9. Residents complaints about potholes left on Efflinch Lane following recent repairs – *signposted to Cllr Brown*
10. Resident enquiry regarding poor mobile phone coverage (Captains Lane) - *signposted to mobile phone provider*

SPCA/NALC

11. Newsletters and training opportunities- forwarded to all Cllrs;
12. Details of new Planning Advice service
13. Copy of SPCA response to Local Government Reorganisation

Barton under Needwood Parish Council Meeting of 2 April 2026

PROPOSAL, RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATION

Item 9.1.2

To review and consider the contract for the Changing Rooms and if necessary to consider suspension of Financial Regulations relating to procurement in accordance with FR 19.2.

The Council's relevant Financial Regulations are as follows:

5.6 For contracts estimated to exceed £15,000 including VAT, the Clerk shall seek formal tenders from at least three suppliers agreed by the council] OR {advertise an open invitation for tenders in compliance with any relevant provisions of the Legislation}. Tenders shall be invited in accordance with Appendix 1.

5.13 When applications are made to waive this financial regulation to enable a price to be negotiated without competition, the reason should be set out in a recommendation to the council. Avoidance of competition is not a valid reason.

19.2 The council may, by resolution duly notified prior to the relevant meeting of council, suspend any part of these Financial Regulations, provided that reasons for the suspension are recorded and that an assessment of the risks arising has been presented to all members. Suspension does not disapply any legislation or permit the council to act unlawfully.

Rationale for suspension of Finance Regulations

The Council has sought advice from Steve Parkinson of The Parkinson Partnership. Advice received highlighted that, while it remains within the Council's discretion to seek additional quotations, there are significant practical and contractual risks associated with appointing a separate contractor alongside the main contractor already engaged on site.

The key considerations are:

- The main contractor retains full control of, and liability for, the site throughout the construction period until formal handover to Holland Sports Club.
- Introducing a third-party contractor during this period may create conflicts in site management, responsibility, and insurance liability.
- There is a strong likelihood that alternative contractors would be unwilling to submit competitive tenders due to the complexities of working concurrently on an active construction site under another contractor's control.
- The presence of multiple contractors could lead to disputes over responsibility in the event of defects, delays, or incidents, with potential for each party to attribute fault to the other.
- Seeking further quotations is likely to delay the programme, creating a risk to the timely completion and reopening of the facility.
- There may be practical difficulties in coordinating works, maintaining continuity, and adhering to the construction programme.

These factors present a material risk to project delivery, cost certainty, and accountability.

Recommendation

In light of the above, and subject to the Council being satisfied that value for money can be demonstrated, it is recommended that:

- The Council resolves to suspend the relevant Financial Regulations under FR 19.2 for this specific contract; and
- The Council approves the appointment of the existing main contractor to undertake the Changing Rooms works as part of the wider construction project.

This approach is considered to mitigate delivery risk, maintain programme continuity, and ensure clear lines of responsibility and accountability.