

Barton under Needwood Parish Council - Receipts and Payments Monthly Summary

2026-27

Receipts	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Rents	1,435.00	210.00	70.00	35.00	17.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,767.50		
Interest	9.58	23.35	589.90	0.00	15.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	638.74		
ESBC	44,437.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44,437.82		
LA Other	932.50	0.00	99,965.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100,897.50		
Burial Ground	0.00	2,350.00	600.00	2,120.00	585.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,655.00	16,000.00	-10,345.00
Fishpond	290.00	0.00	540.00	280.00	246.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,356.00	2,500.00	-1,144.00
VAT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Car Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13,785.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13,785.36		
Other	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		
Grants/donations	0.00	2,136.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,136.00		
Total Income	47,104.90	4,719.35	101,764.90	2,435.00	14,649.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	170,673.92		

Payments	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Total	Budget	Budget Balance
Bank Charges	12.58	12.90	0.00	34.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	59.59		
Salaries	3,818.97	3,462.52	3,457.63	3,785.55	3,444.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,969.13		
Lengthsmen	254.55	203.40	203.40	254.56	203.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,119.31		
HMRC	1,206.01	1,527.14	1,415.09	1,388.66	1,535.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,072.04		
Nest Pensions	0.00	189.16	189.16	189.16	189.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	756.64		
Admin	1,238.08	2,364.81	730.67	559.51	665.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,558.75		
Donations	0.00	0.00	90.00	150.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	240.00		
CAE - Parks	184.88	1,891.25	388.12	2,550.55	2,567.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,581.99	25,808.00	18,226.01
CAE - Burial Ground	0.00	0.00	195.83	16.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	212.78	5,000.00	4,787.22
CAE - Allotments	1,130.00	0.00	0.00	61.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,191.82	2,152.00	960.18
CAE - Fishpond	165.07	0.00	239.66	915.00	1,260.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,580.09	2,500.00	-80.09
Capital Exp	0.00	3,532.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,532.00		
Maintenance	51.19	588.22	710.64	349.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,699.16		
Car Park	101.68	101.68	101.68	127.10	101.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	533.82		
General payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02		
Projects	0.00	922.84	0.00	0.00	25,412.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	26,335.34		
PEC	0.00	0.00	0.00	181.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	181.37	3,500.00	3,318.63
VAT	44.63	1,076.34	321.50	725.28	5,701.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,869.68		
Total Spend	8,207.64	15,872.26	8,043.38	11,288.75	41,081.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	84,493.53		

Barton under Needwood Parish Council -

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

03/09/2026

		£	£	£	Allocation
Payee	Description	Value Gross	VAT	NET	
Salaries total		3,856.02		3,856.02	HR
Nest Pension Scheme		189.16		189.16	HR
HMRC		1,386.75		1,386.75	HR
Lloyds	Bank Charges	15.64		15.64	Admin
Sky mobile	mobile phone and CCTV data	48.25		48.25	Admin & CAE
Barton Village Hall	Hall hire	520.26		520.26	Admin
JPS	Grounds Maintenance x 2 months	2,934.26	489.04	2,445.22	CAE
Amazon	Printer Ink	140.47	23.41	117.06	Admin
Amazon	Charger cables	8.99	1.50	7.49	Admin
SSE Energy	Electricity Fishpond	1,149.61	54.48	1,207.09	CAE
SLCC	Membership Renewal	316.00		316.00	Admin
MDB	Changing Rooms	30,495.00	5,082.50	25,412.50	Projects
			Total	35,521.43	

Signed:

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

31-Aug-26

Lloyds Business Account	£	2,001.00
Lloyds Commercial Instant Access Saver	£	56,924.32
Unity Trust Bank Instant Access Saver	£	133,459.72
National Savings	£	35,540.95

Total Bank Balances**£ 227,925.99**Add Credits not on Statement£0.00 **£ 227,925.99**Less unrepresented payments:-£0.00 **£ 227,925.99****Opening Balances :-****Bank Statements as at 31st March 2026**

Lloyds Current A/C	£	2,001.00
Lloyds Deposit A/C	£	21,293.11
Unity Trust Bank IAS	£	82,972.14
National Savings	£	35,540.95

Parish Council -

Total £ 141,807.20

<i>Add Receipts to date</i>	£	170,673.92
<i>Less Expenditure to date</i>	£	84,555.13

Total Cash and Investments as at -

£ 227,925.99**Difference** -£ 0.00RFO, S. Rumsby

Barton under Needwood Parish Council

Notes of the Planning Committee 24th August 2026

Present: Cllrs Lord, Sharkey, Swift and Roger Bell as a co-opted member

Apologies: Cllr Hassall, Crawley

Declarations of Interest: Cllr Sharkey for item 5 - P/2026/00812

NB The proposal for Holland Sports Club P/2026/00836 is not on land in the Parish Council's ownership and therefore there are no legal implications or connections to the Parish Council

Point of Information

P/2026/00447 3 The Green Removal of condition 4 a contaminated land condition
The Planning Committee considered this application at its meeting on 27th July. We were confused because this was a pre-commencement condition, and no information was forthcoming with regard to how the condition had been addressed. In the absence of any explanation the Committee felt that they had no option but to object.

We now note an explanation in the Case Officer's report, *"A land contamination pre-commencement formed part of the original planning permission, however, it became evident during the course of this application that the previously approved extension had been substantially completed without discharging the condition. Following a review.....with the Council's Environmental Health department it is clear they have no major concerns....."*.

P/2024/00725 Appeal No. 6013889 The Two Pigs (Red Lion) 47 Main Street

Appeal against the refusal for the retention of single storey side extension and installation of an external kitchen extraction unit

This appeal relates to a refusal of planning application P/2024/00725 for the retention of a single storey side extension and external kitchen extraction unit. The Parish Council had commented that, *"Our main concern is with the potential noise and small pollution from this appliance on neighbouring residential properties in Main Street and to the west on Wales Lane"*.

In reaching its decision, ESBC took the advice of its Environmental Health Department which concluded that any noise and smell did not amount to a statutory nuisance. Notwithstanding this view, however, the reason for refusal states, *"By reason of its proximity to adjoining residential properties and their garden areas and the nature of its operation, which results in a continuous noise being emitted for prolonged periods of time whilst in use, the extraction flue system had an unacceptable material impact on the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjoining dwellings. The development is therefore contrary to Policies DP 1 and SP 1 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework"*.

In response to this appeal being notified to the members of the Parish Council, two or three Parish Councillors expressed their view that the appeal should now be supported.

The Planning Committee has now been able to consider the Case Officer's report, the Decision Notice and the Appellant's Appeal Statement. We note the views of the Environmental Health Department that the statutory threshold for a noise or smell nuisance has not been met. We also realise that as the use has now been operating for possibly a couple of years, then local residents will have had an opportunity to experience life with the extraction system in operation. In addition, whilst we have read the appellant's statement, we have not seen the equivalent of ESBC's Statement of Case. We, therefore, do not have a full picture as to the reasons why ESBC decided to refuse this application and how they will be responding to the appellants. We felt that the opinion of the independent Planning Inspector who could assess the evidence from both sides was the best way of dealing with the issues.

Resolved: In the light of the above, the Planning Committee resolved to recommend to the Parish Council, that no changes be made to the Parish Council's position and that we should let the appeal process take its course.

P/2026/00842 The Hawthorns, Scotch Hills Lane Construction of garden room and covered deck area

The proposal is for a single storey flat roofed timber framed garden room with the associated decking area within the garden area of a converted barn complex which looks like it has been sub-divided into 3 units. The proposed garden room is located partly in the parking area and partly within the garden of the property which at this point is proposed to be surrounded by a timber fence and laurel hedge. According to the accompanying Planning Statement the car parking area will be reconfigured to accommodate the garden room.

Whilst the garden room is timber framed it has a, "*neutral slate grey finish*". The barn conversion is in a rustic red brick, the garden room is of a grey cladding. As a result, it is something of a mystery as to how the applicants can claim that, "*it will not compete with the brick/tile of the existing barns but will instead complement the 'garden' setting*". No explanation is provided as how this will be achieved. We feel that some form of timber cladding would have been more appropriate and been more in keeping with the rustic and agricultural character of the barns. In a similar way the proposal could have had some form of pitched roof design to complement the barns. We acknowledge that the fencing and the hedging do provide some form of landscaping and sense of enclosure, but we feel that this is insufficient, given both the flat roof of the structure and the colour scheme for the proposed materials.

Policy DP 3 states that building within the curtilage need to ensure that they are ancillary to the dwelling and that they are appropriately designed and sited for their intended ancillary purpose. Whilst this type of garden room may be appropriate in a normal suburban garden, we feel that it is out of context in this location set against these converted barns. As such we feel that it is contrary to Policy DP 3. We also feel that it does not represent high quality design by not making a positive contribution to the area in which it is located.

The Planning, Design and Access Statement indicates that the applicants intend to use the structure strictly for the incidental enjoyment of the dwelling house and so we assume that there would be no objection to them accepting a condition to that effect.

Resolved: We object to the proposal as being contrary to Policy DP 3, by not being appropriately designed, and by association Policy SP 24 as not representing high quality design, by not making a positive contribution to the area. If ESBC is mindful to approve the application, however, a condition should be attached to any permission for the garden room use only and not for permanent residential use

P/2026/00836 Holland Sports Club Installation of 3 No. Padel Courts including 9.013m high canopy, maximum 4.0m high perimeter fencing and 4.no 5.35m high floodlights

The proposal is for 3 Padel Courts on an existing multi-surface all weather area to the east of the built development part of the Holland Sport Club. The site lies immediately to the west of two floodlit tennis courts but separated from the Sports Club itself by the multi sports area. The proposal effectively replaces a tennis court with 3 padel courts. The site will have perimeter fencing around each of the padel courts and will be floodlit. It will also be covered by a canopy with a dual pitch roof with a gable end design.

The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement, a Planning and Design Statement, a Heritage Statement and a Flood Risk Assessment.

The site is designated as an existing Sports Hub within the Local Plan and so the principle of development in this location is regarded as acceptable. It is, in effect, replacing one sporting activity on a multi-purpose area with another. There are, however, a number of concerns:-

- We are glad that the Planning Statement finds no policies within the Neighbourhood Plan which are considered relevant – that is probably because we do not have a Neighbourhood Plan;
- We note that no additional parking is provided. We understand that padel courts are a growing area of sporting activity and so if demand is high then how will this affect the capacity of the existing car park?;
- The various accompanying Statements and drawings do not seem to reflect the current situation on the ground with the redevelopment of the former club house area. It would have been helpful for the Statements to have included some idea of the cumulative impact of the padel courts, together with the existing redevelopment;
- Most of the area surrounding the club house is open in nature with playing fields and multi surface areas. The covered nature of the padel courts introduces a built form which we think might be more appropriately located in the area adjoining the club house, so that it is seen as part of the overall complex. If the area was left open, then we would not have the same concerns. Covering the courts changes the nature of what is being proposed particularly when it is divorced from the main building. We have not seen any justification as to why the courts need to be covered;

- We understand that the minimum height of the pitched roof needs to be 6m to fall within the guidelines of the International Padel Court Federation for recreational play. With that guidance in mind, we believe that the overall height of the pitched roof should not exceed the height of the main building, as it should be seen to be subsidiary to it;
- We note that the existing multi sports area is floodlit and floodlighting is also proposed for the padel courts. We assume that the impact of the floodlighting will be mitigated through the use of the canopy, although the floodlighting itself is likely to be intensified for three courts rather than previously for one tennis court. We assume that any proposed new floodlighting will operate to the same intensity and time limits as the existing and be conditioned appropriately;
- The site is located in Flood Risk Zone 3. Whilst we note the contents of the Flood Risk Assessment, we are concerned that the canopy covering the padel courts, through the use of downpipes, may concentrate and possibly increase the flow of surface water run-off, suggesting the need for a drainage strategy for the site.

Resolved: No objection in principle, as the site is within the designated Sports Hub area, but we do have concerns regarding the location, floodlighting, the lack of any additional car parking, the lack of an assessment of the cumulative impact, the lack of any justification for the canopy, and the need for a drainage strategy.

P/2026/00812 50 Meadow Rise Felling of one Redwood tree (A1 of TPO 8)

The proposal is for the felling of a redwood tree in the rear garden of the property. As well as having a Tree Preservation Order, the site also falls within the Conservation Area. The application form states that the tree has become too large for the garden. It states that it occupies half the garden area and that this type of species does not respond well to reduction.

Whilst we accept that the tree is not a native species, the photographs accompanying the application indicate that it looks like it contributes greatly to the amenity of the area. There is no accompanying tree surgeon's report, and the photographs would suggest that it looks healthy and is not dead, dying or dangerous. The photograph also shows that whilst it is a dominant tree, it does not look as though it takes up half the garden area.

Resolved: Objection. The tree appears to make a considerable contribution to the amenity of the Conservation Area. As there is no accompanying tree surgeon's report, there is no evidence to justify its felling as it appears that the tree is not dead, dying or dangerous. Should ESBC be mindful to approve its felling then we would urge that an appropriate and substantial semi- mature tree be replanted to compensate for the loss of this amenity.

P/2026/00811 Barton Court 10 Station Road Light pruning of lower overhanging branches, removal of small low-level branches no greater than 38 mm diameter and raise canopy to provide approximately 2.4m clearance of one European Beech tree.

The tree is in the Conservation Area and the photograph shows that it is a dominant tree of what looks like considerable amenity value. The level of pruning looks appropriate.

Resolved: No objections

Local Plan Scoping Consultation

Following the circulation of the working draft of a response, the document has now been amended to take account of various comments received. These include:-

- Adding comments to minimise the environmental and ecological impact of new development the impact on the highway network and avoidance of flood risk;
- Setting out the planning mechanisms that developers may be required to use to make developments acceptable;
- Setting out the importance of the local plan to support agriculture and biodiversity;
- We also noted new national development control policies (contained in the updated National Planning Policy Framework). These support rural industries without any caveats about the need to protect character, landscape and the countryside, indicating that local policies will be even more important.

Resolved that the Response of the Parish Council to the Scoping Consultation for the Local Plan (attached) be forwarded to ESBC

Terms of Reference

In view of some recent issues regarding the Planning Committee not being able to make resolutions, the Parish Clerk recommended that the Terms of Reference be amended to allow for an additional member and hence the arrival of Cllr West. The opportunity has also been taken to include a reference to the major work that will be required of the Planning Committee regarding the review of the Local Plan.

Resolved: that the Planning Committee endorse the revised Terms of Reference (attached) and recommend their approval to the Parish Council accordingly

Two issues raised not on the Agenda:-

- (1) **P/2025/ 00386 Malverna Sich Lane, Woodhouses** This application for a change of use into a care home was refused but a resident contacted a member of the Planning Committee expressing concern about what uses may be happening on site;
- (2) **P/2026/00440 Erection of 55 dwellings on land off Efflinch Lane** This application is in the process of being determined but again a local resident has approached a member of the Planning Committee to ascertain the nature of various activities taking place on site.

In both cases, it was agreed that we ask the Clerk to contact the relevant Case Officer at ESBC to investigate the circumstances.

Date of Next Meeting Monday 7th September 2026

Barton under Needwood Parish Council

Response of the Parish Council

Local Plan - Scoping Consultation 2026

ESBC recently initiated the review of the Local Plan. The Government has decreed that Local Plans now have to be prepared within a 30 month period. ESBC set out a timetable which sees the final adoption of the new statutory Local Plan for the Borough in May 2029. The timetable also includes three main periods of widespread consultation. This includes a Scoping Consultation, now in August 2026, effectively a Draft Local Plan stage in March/May 2027 and another stage when formal objections are made to the Local Plan in April/May 2028 before being submitted to the Planning Inspectorate to hear formal objections in November 2028. **The deadline for comments at this stage is 27th August.**

Accompanying the Scoping Consultation and upon which comments are also requested is an Engagement Strategy and a Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.

Scoping Consultation Document

This document essentially asks for comments on (a) what the new Local Plan should contain, for example, key objectives, with a view to determining a draft vision and identifying the scale and areas of new development and (b) how the Parish Council wishes to be involved in the process. The scoping is enabled in the document by setting out a range of questions to help our thinking about what the Local Plan should contain. ESBC would clearly like to receive responses online, but this method does not always lend itself to responding in depth. We set out below our thoughts and comments in response to each question.

Just from an administrative point before we start the questions, we would like to point out that there are two “No 18” Questions in the document. In addition, as we downloaded the Scoping document from the website, we noted that it does not contain the date of the deadline for comments. We feel that this is an omission which needs to be rectified in future consultation documents.

Local Plans, their role and purpose

Local Plans are important due to planning legislation stating that you determine planning applications in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The starting point in looking at any application, therefore, is that we need to ask what does the Local Plan say about this proposal – are there any planning policies that apply? In that sense Local Plans set out planning policies which control development and the

use of land. But Local Plans are also forward-looking documents which allocate land for specific purposes, such as housing, open space and industry over the plan period, which in this case is 2025 to 2043. The implication here is that once a Local Plan has been through a process of widespread consultation and an Examination conducted by an Independent Planning Inspector then it should provide considerable weight in determining planning applications and confidence that development will take place on the allocated areas while resisting development elsewhere.

Question 1

We are asked if the plan period needs to be longer than 2043.

We are happy with the plan period being to 2043, as when the plan is finally adopted in 2029 this will have a life of 14 years. The world is far too uncertain to go much beyond this time period. The adoption of the Local Plan should also provide some certainty over the long term, both for the community and the development industry. So, if a proposed development site is located outside the settlement boundary and enough land has been allocated to meet the needs of the area over the plan period then we would hope that that planning policy prevails over the life of the plan. We would also acknowledge, however, that the world does change and that the only way to ensure that the Local Plan remains relevant is to have regular five-year reviews, so as to make any amendments to policy in the light of the changing environment in which it operates.

Question 2

This question asks about the area the new Local Plan should cover.

We are happy that it should cover the current East Staffordshire Borough area. We are aware that East Staffordshire is due to merge with other Staffordshire districts to form a new South Staffordshire local authority as from April 2028. As the new Local Plan will not be adopted until May 2029 then we assume that the statutory Local Plan will continue to apply to this geographical area to 2043 or until such time as the new local authority decides jointly and communally to prepare a new Local Plan for the new local government area.

Question 3

***Question 3(a)** asks about the key objectives for the Local Plan and suggests that it should identify areas and sites for homes, commercial development, town centre uses, facilities infrastructure, settlement boundaries and other land uses.*

We agree with this approach, but a key objective is the need for a development strategy which identifies the main sustainable locations for, particularly, new housing development, backed by sufficiently robust policies to resist development elsewhere.

Another key objective is that, as far as Barton is concerned, there is already an issue with the capacity of the infrastructure and local services. If there is a need for further housing development in the village, then greater investment in infrastructure and services needs to

be made. If this is not practical in advance of any development, then at least it should take place in parallel with it. The timing of any future development needs to reflect that much needed investment is required in local services and infrastructure. Development, therefore, needs to take into account the local programmes of infrastructure providers. Allocations in the Local Plan need to be time managed to accord with when this provision takes place. The promotion of sustainable development surely means more than just allocating housing development to the settlements with the largest range of facilities. There is a problem that if those facilities are at capacity, then the social objective of sustainable development of having a strong, vibrant and healthy community is not being met. To address these issues the Local Plan needs to set out the infrastructure and services necessary to make developments acceptable. It should also set out the circumstances where developers may be required to use appropriate planning mechanisms, such as S 106 agreements and Community Infrastructure Levies.

Another important objective is to have a clear vision which sets out the role of the rural areas in the Borough. What is the role for agriculture and how is the integrity and character of the countryside to be protected and enhanced as against the need for a carbon neutral future and consequently the pressure, for example, for solar farms. Within this context planning policies need to support the viability of agriculture and biodiversity.

Question 3(b) asks whether we agree that the Local Plan should identify the areas where development should consider its impact in greater detail such as for Conservation Areas, the open countryside and the National Forest.

Yes, we wholeheartedly agree. As an example, in Barton we have been concerned for some time at the gradual dilution of the quality and the fabric of the Conservation Area. We feel that not enough attention to detail has been taken in the determination of planning applications in these areas. If there are to be national development control policies, then it becomes even more important that the Local Plan policies should reflect the particular local circumstances and distinctiveness.

As well as these designated locations, care should also be taken to protect the distinctive character of each village through detailed design policies and also policies to maintain their character through the designation of areas to prevent their coalescence. Particular areas of landscape or townscape character should be identified.

Greater priority also needs to be given to the role of the National Forest and what it means especially for that particular part of the Borough, for example, the A 38 corridor is within the National Forest, but you wouldn't know it!

Question 4

This question is about the Local Plan having policies and standards which reflect local character. It talks about Supplementary Plans and Master Plans as a means of helping developers to deliver sustainable developments.

It is not clear what is meant by these Supplementary Plans and what status they will or should have in the Local Plan. We have certainly been urging for some time that when the Local Plan allocates a site for development, it should do much more than just set out the amount of housing that is required. ESBC should be able to identify the issues and requirements that they would wish a developer to deliver in order to facilitate the housing development. This could include, the amount of open space, transport and parking requirements, the amount and type of affordable housing, landscaping issues and space for flood mitigation etc. If these were set out in a Development/Design Brief which was part of the Local Plan, then they could be subject to debate at the Examination in Public. So, if this is what is meant by a Supplementary Plan then we would support this approach.

The other issue of concern is that the amount of guidance and information contained in the Local Plan itself in order to justify a policy is limited. To ensure wider understanding and to help effective implementation Local Planning Authorities normally produce Supplementary Planning Guidance or Documents. These are regarded as “material considerations” and can be taken into account in determining planning applications. Design Guides are a good example of this and Question 22 deals specifically with this. It is not at all clear, however, as to whether the existing Supplementary Documents (SPDs) will be continued. An example of this is the Shopfronts SPD which explains the policies in more detail and gives advice on design, signing and lighting. If there are going to be national development control policies, then there will be a distinct need for these interpretations which reflect local distinctiveness and character. We, therefore, support the continuation of SPDs as Supplementary Plans if that is the way to retain these guidance documents.

Question 5

This asks about the things that affect us as individuals and what we aspire to with a view to deriving a vision for East Staffordshire. The question specifically asks to think about the area in which we live and how it should change by 2043.

The “Vision thing” is always a difficult issue to get to grips with. Yes, we all want a better life, but this has to be placed in the context of what the preparation of the Local Plan, with its emphasis on land use, can actually achieve. The Parish Survey from 2024 can perhaps throw some light on the issues which local residents feel are important in Barton. Green spaces and public footpaths are important, and any Vision would want to see these areas retained, protected and enhanced. One particular characteristic of Barton is the abrupt relationship between the built-up area and the open countryside. This is particularly significant to the north of Main Street, where you only need to walk past the Village Hall on Crowberry Lane and open the gate and you are immediately in the countryside and the footpaths to Dunstall. This feature is an asset which needs to be recognised and designated with restrictive policies on development in the Local Plan in recognition of its landscape character. The Survey also noted the need to use and support local businesses and Local Plan policies can achieve this by resisting their change of use. Barton is recognised as a Rural Centre, but planning policies need to support the viability of its designation. In recent years several commercial premises have been allowed to be converted to residential use. If this happens in the future how can the Rural Centre designation be retained? Parking in the village was identified as a major issue in the Survey. This appears to have become worse as more housing has created more

traffic, which by association means that driving through the village becomes more hazardous as drivers negotiate through traffic and parked cars on either side of the road.

We have already mentioned above the issues of infrastructure and capacity of local services. In summary, we do not think we have any grand vision for the future of Barton, but it is more a case of ensuring what we have got works more effectively and efficiently, and that local services and facilities are retained and expanded.

Housing

Question 6

This question asks how many houses are needed and of what type.

Although the document asks how many houses are needed, ESBC gives us the answer of 11,088 over the period to 2043. We have no evidence to contest this figure and assume that indirectly the figure accords with the Government's requirement for 1.5m homes. The per annum calculation derived from this figure looks like it will be higher than the current Local Plan and so the more pertinent question is where are the houses going to be located? The consultation suggests that in order to meet the various housing needs then some houses will need to be sold at reduced prices to those on lower incomes and first-time buyers and some houses will need to be provided to meet the need of the housing waiting list.

The Parish Council supports this approach and for some time has been promoting planning applications and other development proposals to achieve more affordable housing. It will be important to spell out in detail in development briefs just how many affordable houses and of what type. We assume that you will have detailed discussions with social housing providers.

Question 7

The question states there is a need to make sure properties are built which are suitable for our ageing population and indicates a need to have a policy which sets out how many bedrooms new housing should have.

We wholeheartedly support this approach. For some time, we have been arguing that this approach should be included in the Local Plan. It is a major omission. There is a table in the Housing Choice SPD to this effect, but this does not always appear to have been used and will not carry as much weight as a policy. We were disappointed when, despite bringing forward evidence of need for two and three bedroom houses, the percentage of four and five bedroom houses on the new developments allowed in the village was of the order of 80%. A policy approach to determine houses by bedroom size is long overdue. In villages like Barton such smaller properties will enable the older population to downsize and provide more opportunities for first time buyers. We understand that recent village housing surveys have also identified a shortage of bungalows. These can be attractive for people wanting to

downsize and by having the double advantage of freeing up other properties in the process. The provision of bungalows could help to provide a wider choice of house types.

Where are the new houses going?

Question 8

This asks about where housing should be located. Whilst some already permitted developments will go some way to meeting future needs, more sites will be needed. ESBC would like to support town centres with new homes, but they also want to locate near to places of employment and schools. Access to public transport is also important.

We agree that as much as possible new housing should be close to existing services and facilities and places of work. There should also be increased opportunities for good access to public transport so as to reduce reliance on the car. Consideration should also be given to minimising adverse environmental and ecological impact, avoidance of flood risk and impact on the highway network.

Question 9

This asks the question about where housing should be located but within the rural areas and villages. ESBC states that some new housing to allow growth in these settlements will help residents remain in their communities will be considered, whilst safeguarding the character of each settlement.

We recognise that Barton, as a strategic village does have access to a reasonable range of services and facilities. If the new development strategy is similar to the current one, then we also recognise that the four strategic villages are likely to be targeted for some further housing development. The problem we face is that Barton has reached certain physical thresholds to development. At present there is a good sustainable relationship between the location of where people live and the services and facilities they need and use. People can generally walk to the shops on Main Street, to the schools and the GP surgery. But we have previously raised the issue of the capacity of some of these services in Q3(a). Further development will clearly make additional demands and increase pressure to those overloaded services. We hope that this issue is taken seriously when considering both the amount and location of further development. In our response to Q5 we have already stated the importance of retaining the open area to the north of Main Street, so we would hope that this area that can be safeguarded. If further developments are proposed in other directions on the outer fringes of the village, then we believe that you make these locations unsustainable. Reasonable thresholds for walking to facilities and services, especially the schools, will be breached. If that happens, parents drive their kids to schools, people will use their cars to travel to Burton and bypass the village and this then threatens the viability of the Rural Centre. So, we accept that further housing growth is perhaps inevitable, but we ask that very careful attention is given to the particular character of the village and its sustainability, and the capacity of infrastructure and services.

Different types of housing

Question 10

This question asks about the type of affordable housing, for rent, part owned part rented, low-cost housing for sale and the needs of first-time buyers. Recent evidence suggests ESBC should include a policy which asks that all new developments should make provision for 40% to be affordable.

Yes, we support this approach, especially in Barton where house prices appear to be above the Borough average. We have previously suggested in response to Q4 that where Development/ Design Briefs or even Supplementary Plans are prepared that these identify in detail the Planning Authority's requirements in terms of affordable housing and the quantities of each type. This will make the Local Planning Authority's requirements for each site transparent and will have the benefit of developers being able to question the viability of these sites in the Examination in Public.

Question 11

This puts forward the need to support people and families most in need of a home by prioritising social rented housing.

Yes, we support this approach

A footnote to this question states that ESBC has an obligation to provide gypsy and traveller accommodation, and sites can be assessed through the Local Plan process

Climate Goals

Question 12

This question deals with issues around climate change. ESBC would like to use previously developed land rather than greenfield site. They want to encourage development to be of the highest possible quality and be carbon neutral. They also ask for suggestions about how to promote more renewable energy.

We support the principle of giving priority to developing brownfield sites first. This may operate in the larger towns of Burton and Uttoxeter, but obviously in the villages there will be limited opportunities to use brownfield sites. In these situations, there will be a need to ensure that if greenfield land is taken then it is developed with sensitivity to the character of the village and the surrounding landscape.

We also support the need for high quality and carbon neutral development. This desire however, needs to be accompanied by a robust design policy, which has clear aims and objectives. See response to Q 22

Question 13

To reduce the impact of new development ESBC suggests development should be located near existing facilities. Floodplains should be protected, and developments should use landscaping to promote local biodiversity. Higher density development should be requested in town centres.

Yes, we agree with all of these proposals with the proviso that ESBC needs to recognise that even in villages, such sustainable locations may not be practical or sustainable (see response to Q9). If such locations are not possible or practical, then what happens to the strategy for development in villages?

Employment Growth

Question 14

ESBC says that it is important that we retain a variety of employment land and provide opportunities for companies to relocate and expand and attract new businesses, so that our population can be employed locally. Large new developments provide opportunities for residents to increase their skills and create new jobs. It is estimated that over the plan period 125 hectares of new land for industry, warehousing and offices will be needed. This is likely to be on greenfield sites on A38 and A50 corridors. Industrial land may also form part of housing and commercial development such as at Branston. We are asked if these are the most suitable locations.

Yes, they are, but with the proviso that warehousing, for example, along the A 38 corridor is not so dominant and stark in the landscape such that it can be seen over long distances. It doesn't look as though there has been much attempt in this location to reflect the importance of the National Forest.

We are also concerned that large areas of land allocated for industrial purposes appear to be invariably taken up for warehousing which in some cases is speculative. Warehousing by its very nature may not be so labour intensive. What opportunities are there through the planning system to promote more jobs through encouraging appropriate industries?

As well as these large sites, there is also a need to ensure that there are opportunities for small businesses to start up and thrive. Whilst we support the opportunities for the redevelopment of brownfield sites for housing, such smaller sites could also provide opportunities for retail, industrial and commercial uses. This will be particularly important in the villages and the rural areas, with the potential to create sustainable locations.

Question 15

This asks about whether it's important to ask developers to offer training opportunities.

Yes, we agree, but we are not sure how this will work in practice through a Local Plan policy which is solely concerned with land use. How could this be enforced in planning terms?

There is surely an opportunity here to link a request for training with what appears to be the Government's emphasis on employers creating apprenticeships, for which JCB seems to be a leading example in this area.

Town Centres

Question 16

This question recognises the changing role of town centres to provide leisure and cultural activities, particularly emphasising the evening economy, as much as retail uses and use. Do we agree with this approach?

Yes

Question 17

ESBC thinks there may be more scope for residential uses on the upper floors of shops, particularly for more specialist housing.

Yes, we agree. But planning policies will need to ensure that if you are moving to more leisure uses and to an evening economy for town centres then the amenities of those residents in these locations are also protected.

Question 18

ESBC's evidence suggest that there won't be a need for large new retail space and that therefore the emphasis of planning policies will be in reusing vacant floorspace in town centres to ensure future vitality. Do we agree

Yes

Our countryside and villages

Question 18

We are asked if we agree with the current hierarchy of settlements in the countryside, which consists of larger villages, such as Barton, smaller villages such as Abbots Bromley and even smaller settlements and hamlets. Do we agree with this pattern?

Yes, we agree. It is difficult to know what ESBC is trying to get at by asking the question. The majority of new development should be directed to Burton and Uttoxeter as these are the two largest and most sustainable settlements. The only way in which this pattern is likely to change is if ESBC were positively going to promote some form of new settlement. If that were the case then we would have expected that scenario to have been put forward as a possible solution to the question of where new housing was going to be located, and that does not appear to be the case. The level of facilities and services in villages may also change over time.

Barton is identified as a Rural Centre which means that it serves not just the village but the surrounding catchment as well. We have been concerned that decisions allowing the redevelopment of commercial premises to change to residential use have helped to undermine this role and function. So, there is also a need for the Local Plan not just to define strategic villages or rural centres but also to set out how they will be expected to achieve their objectives of meeting local needs both within the village and their catchments.

Question 19

Within the countryside are farms and other businesses which needs a rural location. They form part of the character of the area, whilst safeguarding the countryside.

Again, we find it difficult to understand what ESBC is getting at here. If we are being asked that we should support the businesses and farming enterprises that need to be in the countryside, then the answer is yes. Our only caveat to this is that the countryside of East Staffordshire is precious and the infrastructure, including rural lanes, is often substandard. There is, therefore, a need to recognise that appropriate businesses and enterprises, especially tourism uses, must be proportionate to the area in which they are proposed, otherwise they could harm rather than safeguard the rural character. We have been alarmed by the new National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026), national decision making policies for rural areas (E4) seem to want to support rural businesses wherever they are located and whatever impact they might have. There is surely a case here for Local Plan policies to protect the countryside.

As these uses are generally located outside settlement boundaries then restrictive planning policies should still apply. Because of this approach, farming diversification or tourism projects still need to be justified. So existing policies which ask for information about how these uses can support the local economy or how they will affect the long-term viability of the farming enterprise will still be necessary and information assessed accordingly

Health and Wellbeing

Question 20

ESBC wants to promote healthy lifestyles. Accordingly, the Local Plan will encourage active lifestyles, by reviewing local standards for open space and will consider is national policies

make adequate provision to meet local needs. ESBC states that it will also look to see if other policies can guide planning permissions to eat more healthily. Do we agree?

Yes, but we are concerned that as planning is concerned with land use, we wonder how far planning policies can achieve this objective. Yes, open space standards and the various types of open space needs to be looked at and the provision of footpaths and cycleways can also support well-being. But how can planning policies tackle obesity, for example? Having said that, we noted recently where a proposal for a takeaway was refused in an area of high levels of childhood obesity. Previously, Local Planning Authorities would only have been able to assess whether the land use was appropriate. If Government planning guidance to Local Planning Authorities is heading in that direction of looking at how land use can affect healthy lifestyles then some positive planning policies would be worthwhile.

Heritage and Biodiversity

Question 21

ESBC states that our heritage and biodiversity are very important. The protection, safeguarding and enhancement of heritage and biodiversity aligns with national policies and, therefore, ESBC does not intend to include separate policies, but they will keep this under review. Do we agree?

Whilst we agree that our heritage and biodiversity is important, we disagree that this can be dealt with by generic national planning policies. What may be sustainable in Battersea may not be applicable to Barton. Applying national policies to all areas would seem to go against the whole idea of protecting what is locally important with its distinctive significance. We feel that there is a need for greater emphasis and more detailed policies to safeguard and enhance the local environment and heritage. This could take the form of identifying local character through creating non-designated landscapes and important local and historical buildings and sites.

We have the opportunity with the restoration of the nearby sand and gravel workings to promote more joined up thinking and working between the responsible authorities. The current Local Plan (para 4.18) exhorts ESBC to promote this joined-up thinking, but we have not been aware of much progress. Perhaps the preparation of this new Local Plan could provide a much-needed urgency. A more strategic approach is required to achieve a balance between landscape restoration, recreational use and wildlife protection. The opportunity is there in the Trent Valley and there is a role for Borough Council here, particularly if promoting healthy lifestyles is a priority.

In Barton, we feel that the fabric and integrity of the Conservation Area has been diluted over the years. Whilst more plastic windows have appeared, ESBC, for some reason, do not appear to favour Article 4 Directions for Conservation Areas. ESBC can be more proactive, for example, the heritage planning policies require heritage statements, but those provided by applicants are very poor, if indeed they are provided at all. More proactive working with

applicants to improve their schemes is also important. Although planning policies seek to safeguard and enhance both listed buildings and the Conservation Area, only views from the public gaze appear to be important, whereas the policies apply to the Conservation Area as a whole. The Conservation Area Appraisal was last undertaken in the village in 2009 and is long overdue for reassessment. Any review should also be accompanied by a Management Plan to provide a strategy for positive improvement proposals and in determining planning applications.

Design

Question 22

ESBC has a Design Guide. This document identifies the design characteristics of the Borough. ESBC proposes to use this document and update it when appropriate. Do we agree.

Wholeheartedly YES!! The ESBC Design Guide really is an excellent document but, from the Parish Council's perspective, we feel it is underused in determining planning applications. We rarely see references to it in case officer reports.

Similarly, Policy SP 24 which promotes high quality design appears to be quite a good comprehensive policy, but again it does not seem to be valued by case officers. It sets out an imperative that all new development must make a positive contribution, but case officer reports rarely state how this has been achieved. The policy also asks applicants to state how they have met the criteria within the policy, but this rarely happens. There is also an opportunity for experts to give a second opinion through a Design Review Group, but we are not aware of this having been used and we have not been informed of its composition. ESBC possibly needs to be more proactive in working with applicants to achieve better designed schemes.

In our view improving design quality in both householder and major developments needs to be a high priority for the Local Plan. The tools are probably there with some tweaking, but they need to be more rigorously applied.

Barton under Needwood Parish Council/ August 2026

Engagement Strategy for the Local Plan

ESBC has decided to have a separate engagement strategy at each of the main consultation stages. The purpose of the consultations is to provide an opportunity to comment and help shape the Local Plan as it develops to its final version. All documents will be on the ESBC website, and this will include all supporting evidence. This consultation period will last 28 days

We note that the Parish Council is regarded as a “Relevant Consultation Body”. We assume that this means that we will receive all documents at the consultation stages and at least be notified of all other Local Plan documents especially background evidence documents. If that is the case, then we are happy with this level of engagement. Parish Councils are asked to share the Borough’s social media posts and to place a poster on their community notice boards.

In the light of our experience with previous consultations, the Parish Council’s main comments with this Engagement Strategy are about ease of access to material. We have noted in the past, for example, particularly with Supplementary Planning Documents, that documents have been difficult to find. The adopted document is readily available but if you wanted to find out how the Parish Council’s comments had been taken dealt with, then the Report of Consultation is not available in the same location. Instead, you invariably have to search and try and find the Cabinet meeting which discussed the document and then find the report as an Appendix to that Committee. This arrangement is just not good enough.

People and organisations often go to a lot of time and trouble to respond to these documents, so there needs to be more of a direct link between what people have said and how you have responded. We would, therefore, suggest that all reports of consultation should set out the comments, who made them and ESBC’s response. In the case of this Scoping Consultation, we would, therefore, expect to find on the website, this Scoping Document, a Report of Consultation, setting out the comments that have been received and perhaps a summary report setting out how this consultation is helping to shape or give direction to the development of the Local Plan. All these documents should be available in this one easily accessible place and not hidden away.

The role of the Development Plan Committee needs to be more adequately defined. We assume that this is the main member led body within the Council for the Local Plan other than at key stages where the Cabinet or indeed Full Council may be required to approve documents. Are Development Plan Committees open to the public or are they confidential, and are the Minutes publicly available?

Barton under Needwood Parish Council	
	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
Planning Committee - Terms of Reference Revised August 2026	

Introduction

This document sets out the purpose of Barton under Needwood Parish Council Planning Committee and how it will operate.

Purpose of Committee

The purpose of the Committee is to review planning matters on behalf of the Council.

Planning matters will be sent to full Council and any Co-opted members of the Planning Committee.

Specific duties of the Planning Committee are as follows:

- To view planning applications and related matters received and respond on behalf of the Parish Council within the allotted timeframe.
- Monitor development within the Parish that appears to require planning permission and ensure that appropriate permission has been granted; liaising where necessary with the Planning Authority.
- Monitor development within the Parish that has been granted planning permission and ensure that conditions are being complied with; liaising where necessary with the Planning Authority and enforcement officers.
- To meet or communicate as and when necessary to comply with the above terms. This is usually every two weeks.
- To report to the Parish Council each month on any action taken or proposed to be taken. For comments on routine applications this will be by way of the proforma that accompanies each application or by the Parish Council email site to the Parish Clerk who will enter details on the schedule to the agenda for each meeting.
- To represent or arrange representation for the Parish Council where appropriate at meetings of the Planning Authority or any planning enquiry.
- To formulate a response, for approval by a meeting of the full Parish Council, to the various consultation stages in the preparation of the Local Plan and any other appropriate planning policy documents. In particular, this will involve preparing formal objections to the Local Plan when it is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. It will also involve representing the Parish Council, as necessary, at the Examination in Public into the Local Plan

- liaising with all other bodies and Parish Councils on planning issues affecting Barton and adjacent or nearby parishes;
- preparing responses, for approval by a meeting of the full Parish Council, to Government reports and documents dealing with planning issues and policies."
- With regard to risks associated with Planning, the Committee shall, on behalf of the Parish Council:
 - Own and manage any risks arising from planning matters as recorded in the Parish Council's General Risk Assessment Document
 - Identify and manage mitigating actions relating to any planning risks recorded in the General Risk Assessment Document

Delegated Authority

The Committee will have delegated authority to respond to planning matters behalf of the Council with all comments being ratified at the next full Council meeting subject to where appropriate:

- Financial implications (in consultation with Finance Committee and/or Parish Council).
- Full Parish Council consultation where matters are considered significant enough or where a Full Council Member has specifically requested the matter be brought before full Council, an extension of time to respond having been granted.
- Planning Communications to be drafted by the Committee and if deemed significant enough, brought before Communications Committee for substantiation.

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 ratification at the next full Council meeting.

Frequency of Meetings: The committee shall meet fortnightly where there are planning applications or other planning matters to be considered.

Membership: To be drawn from members of the Council and consist of up to 5 members. External members may be co-opted as required but non-Councillors may not vote.

Quorum: Three members of the Committee – to include co-opted non-Councillor members.

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

Public Participation: Meetings will be open to the public with a maximum of 15 minutes allowed for public participation at the start of the meeting. Parishioners may make observations and question the Parish Council regarding issues on the Agenda, or raise issues for future consideration at the discretion of the Chairman. Members of the public

wishing to raise issues which are not on the Agenda are asked to notify the Clerk before the meeting. Members of the public may not take part in the Council meeting itself

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

DRAFT

CORRESPONDENCE & COMMUNICATIONS

GENERAL

1. Resident complaint via telephone regarding worsening Broadband signal (O2) – *Clerk suggested complaining to provider and contacting MP.*
2. Resident complaint about overflowing bin not being emptied outside Barton Stores. – *Clerk reported to ESBC*
3. Resident copy correspondence with Civil Enforcement, including photos of parked vehicle on pavement outside post office.
4. Resident request for scattering of ashes into Memorial Garden with no plaque – *Clerk responded, as authorised by CAE*
5. Resident complaint regarding multiple items surrounding handling of changing rooms project and request for details of where to escalate – *Clerk responded*
6. Resident request regarding potential noise nuisance from Middle Bell event 30/8/26 – *Clerk response directing them to ESBC Community & Civil Enforcement Pollution team.*
7. Residence enquiry as to whether there were any plans for another Brook Working Party in the Autumn and update on suggested measures such as leaky dams – *Clerk forwarded to BPC Flood Risk Group*

ESBC

8. Cllr George report of maintenance needed to Welcome sign by Little India. (cc'd all Cllrs)

SPCA/NALC

9. Newsletters and training opportunities- forwarded to all Cllrs;