

**MINUTES OF THE VIRTUAL MEETING OF ROLLESTON ON DOVE PARISH COUNCIL  
HELD ON MONDAY 11 MAY 2020 COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM**

**PRESENT**

Councillor S McManus (in the Chair)  
Councillors Badcock, Gooding, Houston, E McManus, Robson, Sanderson, Stewart and Wyatt

**In attendance**

County Councillor White  
1 Member of the public  
Mary Danby, Clerk

**PUBLIC FORUM**

There was no Public Forum as this had been suspended for the meeting (as advised on the Agenda).

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Toon

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS**

Councillor Robson declared a disclosable non-pecuniary interest in Minute No. 3.1 (P/2020/00416) as his home is to the rear of the applicant property.

Councillor Wyatt declared a disclosable non-pecuniary interest in Minute No. 3.1 (P/2020/00341) as he is a member of the Scout Group's Executive Committee.

**3. PLANNING**

**3.1 Planning Applications**

<b>Planning Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
P/2020/00325 Objection – see Annex 1	Land adjacent to 97 Station Road	Construction of raised plateau and compensatory floodplain storage
P/2020/00341 No objection	Rolleston Scout HQ Station Road	Erection of two storey and single storey side and rear extensions and rear canopy area
P/2020/00386 No comment (application made on behalf of the parish council)	Opposite to Rolleston Club 15 Burnside	Reduction in size of Willow by approx. 20%, length of reduction around 3m to 4m (T1), fell two self-set Willows (T2 and T3), reduction in size of Willow by 20% (T4), crown raise and cut back from BT pole and clear phone wire of one Alder (T5), re-pollard Willow stump (T6)
P/2020/00388 No objection	18 Brookside	Erection of a single storey rear extension

Planning Application No.	Address	Proposal
P/2020/00416	Grey Gable Hall Grounds	Crown reduction in height by up to 1.5m of 1 Conifer hedge, overall crown reduction by up to 1.5m of 1 Acer tree, crown reduction in height by up to 1m of 1 Lawson cypress tree, removal of small branches of 1 Rowan tree, crown lifting by up to 3m of 2 Lime trees and cut back 1 Lime tree away from BT lines
No objection		

3.2 **Planning Decisions**

**RESOLVED** That the planning decisions set out in the agenda be noted.

4. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** That the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 09 March 2020 be approved and signed as a true record.

5. **MATTERS ARISING**

**Public Forum – Flooding**

Councillor S McManus reported that he had been in contact with the Environment Agency (EA) and they had agreed to come to a parish council meeting. He reported that a resident, Allan Boast, had also been in contact with the EA and he had copied his emails and the responses to the council Chair.

The EA have said that they do not have any sluices on the River Dove or the brook, only at the Tutbury Mill Fleam, on the night of 16 February the Rivers Trent and Dove had filled up, and then the brook.

Councillor S McManus said that he had raised the issue of flooding with Kate Griffiths MP and a meeting with her, the EA and the parish council was to be arranged. County Councillor White said that he would like to be involved in the meeting.

A further email had been sent to the EA requesting clearance of the brook and copies of the Inspection Reports had also been requested. **It was agreed** that a copy of the email should be provided to all parish councillors.

Councillors noted that:

- On the night in question the River Trent level was not particularly high, so it was assumed that the debris blocking the brook must have caused the flooding.
- The repeated flooding when the River Dove clearly has capacity to take the water is the main issue, properties in Anslow Lane and Burnside are also affected.

County Councillor White said that the EA needs to be held accountable – the policy of not removing debris and lack of dredging of the brook is not credible.

Councillors queried who is responsible for the Brookside Ford where there are now deep channels on either side of what has become an island. County Councillor White said he would seek clarification from Staffordshire Highways on the rules and regulations regarding fords

and he would liaise with Councillor Gooding and Brookside residents as to whether the Ford is necessary.

Councillor S McManus said that surface water flooding issues had been raised with ESBC by Barry Edwards and that he had forwarded some of Mr Edwards correspondence to Kate Griffiths MP seeking her intervention.

Councillors queried if works on private properties on Beacon Road/Chapel Lane would adversely impact on the flooding issues in that area. County Councillor White said that the County Council had the budget in place this year to resurface the road, but it has been revealed that the sewer network needs to be completely restructured by Severn Trent. Severn Trent had committed to undertake this work, but no timescale had been given and the County Council were unwilling to resurface the road prior to the sewer works being completed. He had sought Kate Griffiths MP's help and she was to write to Severn Trent's CEO to request that the work be done at the earliest possible opportunity.

**Minute 187(f) Community Flood Plan**

Councillor Wyatt reported that he was working on the Community Flood Plan.

**6. COUNTY COUNCILLOR'S REPORT**

County Councillor White said that the County Council was focussed on the Covid-19 outbreak and invited queries from councillors. Councillors noted that the pot holes on Anslow Lane had been badly completed; there are marked up pot holes on Station Road and Church Road which are getting worse; Cornmill Lane had three pot holes – one had been repaired, one had been marked up and one left unmarked.

Councillor S McManus advised all councillors to report these, and other highway issues, on the County Council's online reporting portal. He also said that the issue of potholes, i.e. the lack of a co-ordinated approach to repairs and poor workmanship, had been reported by all parish councils at a recent meeting with Kate Griffiths MP.

County Councillor White said that the Government does not give the County Council enough money for repairing/maintaining roads and the County Council is doing its best.

**7. BOROUGH COUNCILLOR'S REPORT**

Report unavailable as Councillor Toon had given her apologies for absence.

**8. PARISH COUNCILLORS' REPORTS**

8.1 Councillor Wyatt:

- Reported that the bus shelter on Church Road (Tutbury bound) was very dirty. The council gave permission for him to clean the shelter.

8.2 Councillor E McManus:

- Reported that a tree was down over part of the Jinny Trail footpath. Councillor Stewart said that her husband was dealing with this and it would be removed.
- That there were now just over 850 members of the Facebook page. She had also drafted a Social Media policy, and this was with the Chair for review.

8.3 Councillor Stewart:

- Referred to the landslide on part of the bank on the Jinny Trail close to the Stretton Parish Council boundary, approximately 90% of the landslide was on the Rolleston side of the boundary. She said she knew a local resident, Bill Peacock, who would be able to advise on how to best deal with the issue. **It was agreed** that Councillor Stewart and the Chair should meet with Mr Peacock.
- Noted that two bins on the Stretton side of the Jinny Trail had been set fire to and thought this was worth bearing in mind should requests be made for bins to be installed on the Rolleston section of the Trail.
- Reported that the stile on the track adjacent to the Craythorne Road playing field was broken. **It was agreed** that the council's contractor be instructed to repair the stile.

8.4 Councillor Sanderson:

- Said that he was aware that Stretton Parish Council had contracted with Bill Peacock (see Minute 8.3 above) to do work on the Jinny Trail landslide. **It was agreed** that the Clerk check with Stretton Parish Council to see what has been agreed with a view to joining forces to getting the problem resolved.

**POST MEETING NOTE:**

The Clerk contacted the Stretton Parish Clerk who confirmed that Bill Peacock had been asked to give advice on drainage problems further along the Jinny Trail and whilst on site he was asked for his advice on resolving the landslip. Stretton Parish Council have not accepted liability or responsibility of the whole area of the landslip. They are awaiting the formal report (which they will forward to RPC) but they have accepted the quotation for the works to be done – they will liaise with RPC in due course to agree splitting the cost for the landslip works.

- Reported that the planters are being replaced this week as part of the normal contract. Rolleston Club had given permission for their outside tap to be used if required to water the planters. **It was agreed** that the council's contractor be advised that the planters were to be replaced and would need regular watering.

8.5 Councillor Robson:

- Reported that the Jubilee Orchard was currently getting a lot of use by residents.
- Reported that the fence between the Orchard and the allotments had been pulled down and this had been robustly secured by the council's contractor.

**The meeting concluded at 8.55pm due to a problem with the Webex technology (no audio). It was agreed that the meeting would reconvene on 12 May 2020 at 7.30pm.**

MINUTES OF THE RECONVENED VIRTUAL MEETING OF ROLLESTON ON DOVE PARISH COUNCIL  
HELD ON TUESDAY 12 MAY 2020 COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM

**PRESENT**

Councillor S McManus (in the Chair)

Councillors Badcock, Gooding, , E McManus, Robson, Sanderson, Stewart and Wyatt

**In attendance**

1 Member of the public

Mary Danby, Clerk

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillors Houston and Toon

8.7 Councillor Badcock:

- Reported that ESBC's Councillor Community Fund is concentrating on helping people in need during the COVID-19 crisis, particularly people who do not have enough money for food. The Fund is now open for applications up to £500. He confirmed that the County Council has a similar scheme in place where County Councillors have £2,500 each to allocate in their Wards.
- Asked if it was an appropriate time, given the latest Government guidelines, to contact the Burton Conservation Volunteers to commence the footpath maintenance works. **It was agreed** that the BCV be advised that they may commence the work provided they can satisfy the social distancing guidelines as required by the Government.

8.9 Councillor S McManus:

- Reported that Clive Baker had given an update saying that he was working on the Station website and that he was producing a booklet for publication containing information on the railway line between Burton and Tutbury. Mr Baker also said that group members who are permitted to walk during the Lockdown are maintaining minimum maintenance at the Station site. Weeding and dead-heading has been carried out and the platform bench is undergoing re-painting and will be re-assembled on site as soon as possible.
- In response to a query from Councillor Robson, said that the trees provided by RPC on the right-hand side of the entrance to the Jinny Trail were still RPC's responsibility and could be pruned by Councillor Robson - the Station Group would be advised that this work would be done.
- Reported that a tree and hedging on Meadow View backed onto a Forest School Street resident's garden and a complaint had been raised by them. Following a site visit the tree branches which overhung the resident's garden had been trimmed and the hedge would be reduced to half its height by the council's contractor after the bird nesting season has finished.
- Given the latest Government guidance it was noted that Bellway would soon be operating on the College Field site and he said that residents may raise concerns/issues regarding those works in the coming weeks/months.
- Reported that he had been contacted regarding the possibility of a permanent memorial being provided to mark Andy Starbuck's contribution to the village. He said that he would

contact Mr Starbuck's son on what memorial the family might like to see, and he asked that councillors give some thought as to the type of memorial that might be provided.

## 9. FINANCIAL MATTERS

### 9.1 Schedule of payments

Payee	Description	Payment Method	Gross £	VAT £
1&1 IONOS Ltd	RPC website	DD	5.99	1.00
Zurich Municipal	2020/21 Insurance premium	BACS	3,163.41	0.00
Freeola Ltd	Village website	DD	13.86	2.31
Viking	Postage stamps (£28.68) Stationery (£68.68)	BACS	97.36	12.02
Clerk's salary	Clerk's salary and expenses	BACS	872.80	0.17
P Gould	Mowing contract	BACS	1,250.14	0.00
J Deacon	Environmental Officer (£914.53) Renew broken stile on Footpath 9 (£66.00)	BACS	980.53	163.42
Toplis Associates Ltd	2019/20 Internal Audit fee	BACS	161.76	26.96
Rialtas Business Solutions Ltd	Accounts software: Annual support and maintenance fee	BACS	148.80	24.80
EE Ltd	Council mobile (April)	DD	24.68	4.11
			<b>6,719.33</b>	<b>234.79</b>

**RESOLVED** That the above payments be approved.

### 9.2 Bank Reconciliation as at 30 April 2020

		Bank Accounts		Total £
		Treasurer £	Instant Access £	
01 April 2020	Bank Statement	10,607.39	56,555.45	67,162.84
Movement in funds to date	<b>PLUS</b> Income	35,504.50	1,168.99	36,673.49
	<b>LESS</b> Expenditure	4,959.32	-	4,959.32
30 April 2020	Bank Statement	41,152.57	57,724.44	98,877.01

**RESOLVED** That the above was a true record.

## 10. INTERNAL AUDIT

### 10.1 Internal Audit report for the Year Ended 31 March 2020

**RESOLVED THAT:**

- a) The Clerk be thanked for getting the council through with a clean audit without any comments.
- b) The report be noted.

### 10.2 Appointment of Internal Auditor

**RESOLVED** That Toplis Associates be re-appointed as the council's Internal Auditor for the 2020/21 financial year.

**11. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY RETURN 2019/20**

**11.1 Section 1 – Annual Governance Statement 2019/20**

**RESOLVED THAT:**

- 11.1.1 The council prepared its accounting statements in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations.
- 11.1.2 The council had made proper arrangements and accepted responsibility for safeguarding the public money and resources in its charge.
- 11.1.3 The council had only done what it has the legal power to do and has complied with the Proper Practices in doing so.
- 11.1.4 The council had during the year gave all persons interested the opportunity to inspect and ask questions about this authority's accounts.
- 11.1.5 The council had considered and documented the financial and other risks it faces and dealt with them properly.
- 11.1.6 The council had arranged for a competent person, independent of the financial controls and procedures, to give an objective view on whether internal controls meet the needs of this smaller authority.
- 11.1.7 The council had responded to matters brought to its attention by internal and external audit.
- 11.1.8 The council had disclosed everything it should have about its business activity during the year including events taking place after the year end if relevant.
- 11.1.9 The Annual Return: Section 1 - Annual Governance Statement for the year ended 31 March 2020 be approved and the Chair be authorised to sign the document.

**11.2 Section 2 – Accounting Statements 2019/20**

**RESOLVED** That the Annual Return: Section 2 – Accounting Statements for the year ended 31 March 2020 be approved and that the Chair be authorised to sign the document.

**12. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY**

- 12.1 **RESOLVED** That the council will delegate authority to the Clerk in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair (or other councillors should one or the other be indisposed) to take any actions necessary with associated expenditure to protect the interests of the community and ensure council business continuity during the period of the COVID-19 outbreak, informed by consultation with members of the council. All decisions to be minuted appropriately. Delegated authority to cease upon the first face-to-face meeting of the council.
- 12.2 **RESOLVED** That the above Delegation of Authority be added to the council's Standing Orders as Standing Order 18 and the remaining Standing Orders be renumbered.

**13. ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

**RESOLVED** That the Annual Meeting of the Council be held at the next face-to-face meeting of the council.

**14. POSTPONEMENT OF THE ANNUAL PARISH MEETING**

**RESOLVED** That arrangements for the Annual Parish Meeting be put on hold pending clarification from the Government on when such meetings may be held.

**15. ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLICIES**

**RESOLVED** That the following documents be accepted without any amendments being required:

- Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy
- Members and Officers Subsistence/Mileage Policy

**16. THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND:  
EAST STAFFORDSHIRE ELECTORAL REVIEW – COVID-19 UPDATE**

**RESOLVED** That the report be noted.

**17. CORRESPONDENCE**

**17.1 Staffordshire Parish Councils' Association (SPCA)**

The weekly SPCA Bulletins had been forwarded to all councillors.

**17.2 Broken stile, Footpath 9 (Anslow Lane to Tutbury Road)**

Several members of the public had reported that the first stile on Footpath No. 9 from Anslow Lane was broken. The council's contractor was instructed to repair the stile – this work has been completed.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

- a) The above be noted.
- b) A Minute be recorded thanking John Deacon for the good work he had done in repairing the stile.

**17.3 Request for the removal of a speed hump**

A resident contacted the council requesting support in their request to Staffordshire Highways for a speed hump to be removed from in front of their property. The resident has been advised that the council has no authority regarding Highways and that their email has been forwarded to the County Councillor with a request that he investigate this matter.

Councillors agreed that the council would not want to see speed humps removed in the village as this would result in issues with speeding vehicles.

**RESOLVED** That the above be noted.

The meeting closed at 7.58 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

**Minute No. 3.1**

**Submission to East Staffordshire Borough Council:**

<b>Planning Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
P/2020/00325	Land adjacent to 97 Station Road	Construction of raised plateau and compensatory floodplain storage

Rolleston on Dove Parish Council objects to the above planning application on the following grounds:

1. The site is outside the village settlement area; the site is also outside the area covered by the emerging Rolleston Neighbourhood Development Plan.
2. The proposed plateau would create a flood risk for the adjacent properties and properties further down on Station Road.
3. It is noted that the applicant has already been given an Environment Agency permit for the proposed works. Why was the Parish Council not informed of the EA permit application and given the opportunity to comment?
4. **Flooding:** The Flood Risk Impact document in the planning pack is dated as a final draft in May 2019, which is now a year old. This means that in section 2 page 5 several significant floods are well documented since this time and therefore are not taken account of which include 2007, 2019 and 2020 – in reality the village faces flooding multiple times each year in the last 5 years.

The report (2.4 page 12) mentions Carsington Water reservoir some 40 KM away which we would agree itself has a low reservoir flood impact. However, the report does not mention the Brook Hollows historic fishing lake which feeds the brook. While not a reservoir, it is a significant upstream store of water and has been topped several times in the past 5 years, most recently in Feb 2020 and in late 2019 due to water bypassing the waterfall leading to flooding downstream.

Flooding in Rolleston is a complex issue, to summarise the key points:

- The soil is generally clay based and retains water from heavy rainfall for long periods and prevents rainwater permeating and draining through the soil.
- Rolleston is a rural area, in which ditches, especially in the Craythorne Lane area of the village, quickly become filled pouring water down Beacon Road into Chapel Lane, School Lane and Station Road resulting in well publicised flooding effecting the area of this application.
- Sewer and road drains especially on Station Road are well known to experience difficulties in coping with what, in the last 5 years, have regrettably become regular and significant floods effecting the centre of the village in the area of Burnside, Church Road, Brookside, Chapel Lane, School Lane and Station Road – the location of this application.
- The rural nature of the village means the Alderbrook and Dove take water run-off from fields from a large catchment, and often results in flash floods effecting the Station Road and Church Road the central road through the village.

Lastly, we know from February 2020 the successive heavy rain events overwhelm the capacity of the river and that during the second flood of February numerous houses were flooded in Brookside but also on Station Road. In this instance we understand that water was released upstream leading to a breach of the River Dove at circa 4am in the morning which quickly inundated the flood plain to the North of the planning application site. This combined with water from foul drains, ditches, breaching of the Brook Hollows lake, severe road flooding in Burnside and Brookside from the brook contributed to by slow water backing up from the Dove left much of the village underwater causing significant damage to circa 20 homes some of whom have still not fully recovered.

**Fluvial Flooding:** The recent flooding in February 2020 was fluvial flooding resulting from the River Dove yet this has happened more than once in the last 100 years (contrary to statement 2.2 Page 5 of the Flood Risk Assessment).

**Surface Water Flooding:** We would contest that the flood migration would not impact the local area negatively, in the case of the February 2020 flooding we believe the sheer volume of water from the flood plain was uncontainable with over 1 million litres of water on the A38 reported in the press with 'nowhere for the water to go' resulting in in the overnight flooding we saw in Rolleston.

**Sewer Flooding:** Section 2.5 Page 12 – it is well known that surface runoff has combined with foul waste on Station Road leading to foul water flooding – the issues with Station Road drainage are well known in the village.

**Permeability of the mound:** The Flood Risk Assessment does not indicate the permeability of the mound. Though it is not explicit in the documents it implies that soil would be excavated at the North of the site and distributed to the South of the site to create the raised mound. The general view of the document is that the mound itself would not contribute to flooding. However, the supplementary planning statement refers to the construction of 18 houses on the raised plateau in February 2019. Therefore we must assume that while housing is not part of this application, and future potential use is not planning grounds – it surely must be considered in the flooding risk calculations from surface water and sewer flooding models that hypothesis and calculations should be made on the additional contributions housing development would render on the area. If houses were to be built on the mound the water would double run off into the excavated area to the North of the site and would make a material difference to the flooding calculations.

5. The Development Control document itself - the following points which appear inconsistent:
- **Point 7** – Does the proposed development require any materials to be used? The applications indicates No. We would need clarification of this being the case – so that no hard core or stabilising foundations are established in this work that could lead to future development outside of this application.
  - **Point 10** – Are there trees or hedges on the proposed development site? The application indicates No. We are unsure how this can be a true statement when page 3 of the Ecological Appraisal reads: *“The majority of the site was composed of a large open horse grazed field which showed signs of nutrient enrichment and was considered to be of medium ecological value. The hedgerows and mature trees within them were considered to be of high ecological value to nesting and breeding birds as well as to small terrestrial mammals such as hedgehog.*

Annex 1

*Hedgerow 2 in particular was thought to offer valuable habitat to any reptiles or amphibians in the area that may shelter under fallen dead wood and leaf litter. A heavily fissured mature willow tree with rot holes and ivy growth was considered to offer value to roosting bats should they be foraging and commuting through the site. A rubble pathway running through the site was considered to be of low ecological value."*

Several tree sparrows were observed carrying nesting materials along H1 and H3, however, no active or disused nests were located on site. It is therefore recommended that all hedgerows should be retained and a buffer zone be in place during and post development in order to ensure the integrity of these hedgerows is retained where possible. Additional sensitive working practices and enhancements are recommended within the report.

- **Point 10 continued** - Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character? Application answers No. We would argue that the hedge to the south of the site faces Station Road. The characteristic of Station Road is the open fields fringed by hedges such as those in place which contribute to the street scene of the village.
- **Point 12:** Is there a reasonable likelihood of the following being affected adversely or conserved and enhanced within the application site, or on land adjacent to or near the application site? The application answers No. Based on the below we believe the answer for "b) Designated sites, important habitats or other biodiversity features:" should be yes on land near the development, rather than "no":

*"H2 was a species poor defunct hedge ranging in height from 1m – 2m, with a mature willow (Salix sp.) located along the northern site boundary. The hedge supported abundant hawthorn and elder with frequent bramble and displayed large gaps throughout. The mature willow tree displayed heavy ivy growth as well as fissures within the bark and rot holes. Such features were considered to offer medium-high value to roosting bats and nesting birds. This hedgerow also appeared to have been laid historically and its structure was considered to offer value to nesting birds. A notable amount of bird activity was noted along this hedgerow."*

- **Point 18:** Will the proposed development require the employment of any staff? Application indicates No. We are unsure how the mound can be created without the employment of staff to operate machinery; we note there is no plan for workers vehicles or hours of operation of machinery.
- **Point 22:** Can the site be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land? The Application indicates "No". Clearly the site faces Station Road and can be seen from the road and there a five bar gate which provides visibility of the field.