



Rolleston on Dove Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs Mary Danby BA (Hons)
32 Hillcrest Rise
BURNTWOOD
WS7 4SH

Mobile: 07908 545412 (Office hours)
Email: rollestonpc@outlook.com
<https://rollestonondovepc.co.uk>

Our Ref: MD

06 December 2021

To: All Members of the Parish Council

Dear Councillor

You are hereby summoned to attend the Meeting of the Parish Council held in the Old Grammar School Room, adjacent to St Mary's Church, Church Road, Rolleston on Dove DE13 9BE on **Monday 13 December 2021** commencing at 7.30pm at which the business set out below will be transacted.

Yours sincerely

MDanby

Mary Danby
Clerk

COVID-19 AWARENESS

- If you have had any of the main three symptoms of Coronavirus in the previous 14 days please do not come to the meeting – high temperature, a new, continuous cough and a loss or change to your sense of smell or taste.
- You are recommended to wear a mask on arrival until you are seated. You are recommended to wear a mask when leaving your seat.
- Sanitise your hands before entering the meeting room.
- The Clerk will also record attendance for track and trace purposes so signing in is not necessary.
- Maintain socially distancing at all times.

PUBLIC FORUM

A maximum of 15 minutes will be allocated prior to the commencement of the meeting when members of the public may put questions/comments on any matter in relation to which the parish council has powers or duties which affect the area.

1. **Apologies for absence**
2. **Declarations of Interests and Dispensations**
3. **Police**
4. **Planning matters**

4.1 Planning applications

Application No.	Location	Proposal
P/2021/00858	6 Blacksmiths Yard Burnside	Installation of 6 replacement windows and a door
P/2021/01310	Rolleston Scout Group Station Road	Display of V Board relating to the residential development on land off Forest School Street
P/2021/01341	Cliff House Dovecliff Road	Demolition of some existing buildings to facilitate the erection of detached buildings to form 6 Class E units
P/2021/01410	3 Alderbrook Close	Erection of a single storey rear link extension
P/2021/01438	Woodborough Hall Grounds	Cut back in width to roadside one Yew tree
P/2021/01456	Rolleston Club 15 Burnside	Replacement of 2 x external doors on front elevation
P/2021/01499	The Brambles 3 Brookside Court	Felling of 1 Silver Birch tree and 1 Conifer tree
P/2021/01520	Winter House Hall Grounds	Felling of 1 Lawson Cypress tree, 1 Red Oak tree, 2 Self Set Sycamore trees, 1 Holly tree and crown reduction in height by up to 1.5 metres of 1 Laurel tree (TPO 1)
P/2021/01542	18 Church Road	Reduce height by 4 metres and shape one Hawthorn tree (T2), reduce height by 3 metres and shape one Ornamental Cherry tree (T4) and reduce height by 2 metres and shape one Ornamental Cherry tree (T5)

5. Minutes of the meeting held on 08 November 2021 (Enclosure 1)

6. Matters arising from the previous meeting

7. Motion

Councillor Scott has submitted the following Motion:

That the Parish Council should consider declaring a Climate Emergency (See **Enclosure 2** giving the reasons for the proposal).

8. County Councillor's report

9. Borough Councillor's report

10. Parish Councillors' reports

11. Financial matters

11.1 Schedule of payments (as at 06 December 2021)

Payee	Description	Payment Method	Gross £	VAT £
Viking	Stationery	BACS (pd 11/11/21)	26.21	4.37
Clerk	Reimbursement: Paint & brushes (Byelaws signs) £13.95 Land Registry extracts x 2 £12.00	BACS (pd 12/11/21)	25.95	2.32
Clerk	Reimbursement: Pigeon spikes and adhesive (Elizabeth Avenue swing frame)	BACS (pd 16/11/21)	68.82	11.47
O2	Council mobile	DD (pd 23/11/21)	17.03	2.84
WALC	Delegate fee: Local Council climate Action Day	BACS	36.00	6.00
P Gould	Mowing contract	BACS	1,127.33	0.00
SPCA	Training fee: Councillor Fundamentals 2 delegates	BACS	50.00	0.00
C Stewart	Reimbursement: Zoom Pro subscription	BACS	14.39	2.40
Clerk	Salary & expenses	BACS	1,135.87	0.17
HMRC	NI/PAYE: 2021/22 3 rd quarter	BACS	1,091.13	0.00
Hardy Signs	Craythorne car park signs	BACS	228.48	38.08
Manor Park Nurseries	Compost	BACS	9.60	1.60
1&1 IONOS Ltd	RPC website	DD	5.99	1.00
J Robinson	Village Christmas tree	BACS	135.00	0.00
J Deacon	Environmental Officer £1,019.10 Remove graffiti on wall by Brook House £153.50 Install Meadow View Byelaws sign £48.00 Clear nettles from Walford Road jitty £32.40 Install Craythorne car park signs £98.40 Lock/unlock Craythorne car park barrier (November (part month only)) £96.00 Repair to Tafflands tall swing frame £86.40 Footpath from Forest School Street to Meadow View £376.80 Install new sand bins/fill/dispose of old bins £208.80	BACS	2,119.50	353.25
TOTAL			6,091.30	423.50

11.2 Bank reconciliation as at 30 November 2021

		Bank Accounts		Total £
		Treasurer £	Instant Access £	
Opening funds: 01 April 2021		12,875.04	61,700.80	74,575.84
Movement in funds to date	PLUS Income	87,921.67	5,103.35	93,025.02
	LESS Expenditure	70,350.61	7,634.75	77,985.36
Funds: 30 November 2021		30,446.10	59,169.40	89,615.50

12. Actual income/expenditure to 30 November 2021 and Draft 2022/23 budget (Enclosure 3)

13. s106

- 13.1 ESBC have confirmed that the Parish Council's proposed spending of the funds relating to Schedule 6 Community Facilities Contribution for the value of £57,280.00 from the s106 agreement would meet the

obligation to use the funds. ESBC also confirmed that the Parish Council can apply to draw down part of the s106 funds for the Craythorne Road car park railings project. (Minute No. 119 refers)

13.2 To consider whether:

- a) The council wishes the s106 Working Group to continue in its current form, i.e. considering information on the proposed use of the s106 funds and making recommendations to the Full Council, or
- b) The council wishes to disband the s106 Working Group and that consideration on this matter should revert to the Full Council.

14. Risk Assessment (Enclosure 4)

15. Challenge of Climate Change (Enclosure 5)

To consider a proposed three-way use of funding from the County Council's Climate Change Fund.

16. Training opportunities for Councillors (Enclosure 6)

17. Correspondence

17.1 Staffordshire Parish Councils Association

The weekly Bulletins have been circulated to all councillors.

17.2 Communications Log

The Communications Logs have been regularly circulated to all councillors.

17.3 Barton under Needwood Parish Council: Conservation Areas (Enclosure 7)

17.4 Tutbury Parish Council: Proposed Lloyds Bank branch closure (Enclosure 8)

Tutbury Parish Council have resolved to write to all our neighbouring Parish Councils regarding the proposed bank closure at Tutbury in March 2022. It was felt that as statutory bodies who are in a position to represent our parishioners, a collect campaign to complain and lobby government to prevent commercial decisions having such a detrimental impact on our communities should be done. As it is thought that Lloyds are having a key meeting about the closure in January 2022, we would appreciate a written response as soon as possible, in support of our campaign to prevent the closure of the bank. We appreciate your co-operation in this matter and look forward to hearing from you.

17.5 Request for a memorial bench or plaque to be installed on a bench

The council has been contacted by a resident. Her parents also live in the village and have done so for many years. Her mother is heavily involved in a number of charitable projects in the village. The resident says that her brother passed away this year in a tragic road traffic collision and she asks if they could have a bench or a plaque on a bench in the village. Her brother grew up in the village and he was on the Parish Council as a 6th form pupil.

18. Exclusion of Press and public

Chair to move:

That under the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960 (Section 2) (and as expended by Section 100 of the Local Government Act 1972), the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information.

19. Quotations (Enclosure 9)

20. Staffing Matter (Enclosure 10)

**Minutes of a meeting of Rolleston on Dove Parish Council
held at the Old Grammar School Room, Church Road
on Monday 08 November 2021 commencing at 7.30pm**

Present

Councillor Stewart (in the Chair)

Councillors Appleby, Houston, E McManus, S McManus, Robson, Sanderson and Scott

In attendance

Mary Danby, Clerk

108. Apologies for absence

Councillors Badcock and Toon.

109. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

Councillor Stewart declared a non-prejudicial interest in Planning Application No. P/2021/01372 (she lives opposite the application site).

110. Planning matters

110.1 Planning applications

Application No.	Location	Proposal
P/2021/01338	The Brookhouse Station Road	Felling of Yew tree
No comment		
P/2021/01350	69 Meadow View	Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for the retention of a single storey rear extension
No comment		
P/2021/01363	19 Brookside	Overall crown reduction back to previous reduction points to one Tulip tree (T1) by approx 1.5-2m
No objection		
P/2021/01364	18 Brookside	Crown reduction to one Beech tree (T1) by approx 2m, crown clean and clear lamp post
No objection		
P/2021/01372	Beresford House South Hill	Felling of 1 Western Red Cedar tree (T2 of TPO 223)
The Tree Officer is asked to undertake a site visit to ensure that the tree needs to be felled		
P/2021/01389	The Cedar Cottage Hall Grounds	Cut back by up to 3 metres to clear access and crown raise over garage to give up to 1.5 metre clearance of 1 Cedar tree and cut back by up to 1.5 metres of 1 Cherry tree
No objection		
P/2021/01398	9 Brookside	Reduce crown back to previous pruning points, crown lift by 2m to one Walnut tree (T1) and crown reduction by 3m and crown lift by 2m to one Birch tree (T2)
No objection		

111. Minutes

Resolved That the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2021 be approved and signed as a true record.

112. Matters arising

88.3 Land at the Brookhouse Hotel, Brookside

Councillor Sanderson reported that there had been three acts of vandalism on the former Brookhouse Hotel.

93.8(b) Councillor Appleby reported that more Sorn vehicles were being taken apart on the site and there was a growing pile of tyres. **Agreed** that this issue be raised with ESBC.

93.9(a) Councillor Stewart reported that the Craythorne Road car park resurfacing had not been completed satisfactorily and she would raise this with SCC/Amey. Councillor Stewart said she would raise this with SCC/Amey.

On an unrelated matter, it was noted that white line paint from SCC/Amey equipment which had been parked up on Brookside, off Station Road had been used by vandals who had spray painted the brickwork (the empty aerosol can was found on the verge) – Councillor Stewart said she would raise this with the County Councillor.

93.9(b) Councillor Stewart reported that the wood chippings from the tree works had been put on the paths during the Village Clean-up Day.

93.9(d) Councillor Stewart asked the council how Baronet Oswald Moseley should be referred to on the interpretation panel. **Agreed** that the first reference to “Squire” to be changed to read “Squire (the Baronet)” and “Squire” be used thereafter in the text.

101(a) Councillor S McManus reported that the “Tommy” had been put into position for the Remembrance period, but it was looking a little sad and may need to be replaced for next year.

107. Councillor Robson reported that he had paced the site and the details had been passed to the Clerk confirming that six tree could be easily accommodated on the site. **Agreed** that:

- Quotations for tree stakes be sourced
- The council’s contractor be asked to quote to dig the holes
- The school be asked if they would like pupils to plant the trees
- Householdors whose properties overlook the area be advised of the proposal
- The council’s mowing contractor be advised of the proposal

113. County Councillor’s report

Councillor White was unable to attend the meeting, but he had provided the following report:

- The works in the village have now been completed
- He will now focus on the flooding at the Anslow Lane/Knowles Hill junction

Councillors asked when Station Road would be resurfaced and what the lead time is for yellow lines to be installed on Station Road.

114. Borough Councillor’s report

Councillor Toon was unable to attend the meeting and had been unable to provide a report.

115. Parish Councillors’ reports

- 115.1 Councillor Houston said that dog fouling was an increasing problem in the village. **Agreed** that ESBC's CCEO team be requested to visit the village.
- 115.2 Councillor Sanderson asked that a letter of thanks be sent to Gordon Stewart who had put in many hours in awful conditions at the recent Clean-up Day. **Agreed** that a thank you letter be sent.
- 115.3 Councillor S McManus reported that the Civic Trust had established a new online village calendar in an attempt to co-ordinate all the events in the village. He said that RPC's dates had been uploaded, as had those of some of the village organisations.
- 115.4 Councillor Appleby reported that:
- The Beacon Road verges had been reinstated.
 - There had been no news yet from the County Council as to whether permission would be given for Daffodil bulbs to be planted on a section of the Beacon Road grass verge. **Agreed** that the bulbs be planted along the Church wall on The Croft and that council's contractors be advised of this proposal.
 - Young people were parking on Gypsy Lane. **Agreed** that this issue be reported to ESBC and the Police.
 - He referred to parking issues being experienced by residents of Fairfield Avenue and the belief that parking had been promised as part of the development. He was advised that residents should take this issue up with ESBC.
- 115.5 Councillor Robson reported on a "Spotted Rolleston" Facebook posting regarding a blocked drain on Chapel Lane. It was noted that the County Councillor had responded saying that the drain cleaning machine would be visiting the village now that the road works had been completed.
- 115.6 Councillor Scott said that he was looking to combine a potential Farmers Market and allotment provision into a climate change framework project. He said that he hoped the council would permit him to attend a climate change conference being organised by WALC in the New Year (see Minute No. 120).
- 115.7 Councillor Badcock was unable to attend the meeting, but he had provided a written report:
- The work on the Lower Lake in Brook Hollows moves forward slowly. The bank leading down to the water's edge has been strimmed back and ESBC Open Spaces team tell me that this will now be cut and maintained. Further clearance work on this bank is planned, including the cutting back of the brambles at the side of the waterfall. ESBC Open Spaces team are awaiting delivery of the replacement litter bins and an order to do work on the bridge over the waterfall is being placed, with the work being planned for Spring. Prices for the paths on the north side from the Lawns to the waterfall bridge and on the south side from the bottom of Knowles Hill to the steps are being obtained. The paths will be all weather and 1.8 metres wide.
- The Friends have got off to a really good start. A considerable amount of training has been undertaken and delivered by ESBC and Burton Conservation Volunteers. A number of activities have taken place on the site. I would like the council to consider emailing Tim Salmon, to congratulate him on the progress made so far, and ask him to pass on the PC's appreciation to all the Friends' volunteers. **Agreed** that Tim Salmon be written to as requested.
- 115.8 Councillor Stewart:
- a) Asked that a thank you letter be sent to Janet Sanderson for sorting out the planters which are not maintained by the contractor. **Agreed** that the letter be sent as requested.
 - b) Asked that a thank you letter be sent to Allison Gordon, Beaver Scout Leader for the work she did in arranging for the Beaver Scouts and Cub Scouts to attend and plant bulbs at the recent Clean-up Day. **Agreed** that the letter be sent as requested.

- c) Temporary signage had been installed at the Craythorne Road car park advising the winter closing time.
- d) Asked for ideas to be sent to her for decorating the council's Christmas tree for the St Mary's Advent Festival.
- e) Advised that the Contractor Review Meetings had been held prior to the council meeting. It was noted that there had been positive feedback from members of the public on the work done by John Deacon on the mound. Phil Gould had referred to a post on the footpath which prevented him from accessing Craythorne from Tafflands and he asked if this could be removed. It was noted that the post had been installed to stop quad bikes, etc accessing Craythorne. **Agreed** that Mr Gould be asked, as a compromise, if he would be happy if the council were to look to replacing the post with a removeable bollard.

116. Financial Matters

116.1 Schedule of payments

Payee	Description	Payment Method	Gross £	VAT £
Burton Tree Care	Tree works (PO Nos. 28, 29 & 30 covering work on 3 separate days – works arranged as a 3-day block for ease of access)	BACS (pd 25/10/21)	990.00	0.00
Hardy Signs Ltd	Byelaws signs	BACS	68.64	11.44
Royal British Legion	Remembrance Wreath	BACS	17.00	0.00
P Gould	Mowing contract	BACS	1,127.33	0.00
Warwickshire & West Midlands Assn of Local Councils	WALC Annual Conference – Delegate fee x 1	BACS	12.00	2.00
Ricoh UK Ltd	Photocopier: Copy charges: £116.82 Rental: £113.41	BACS	230.23	38.37
Rolleston Club	Reimbursement of defibrillator pads/battery	BACS	178.00	0.00
1&1 IONOS Ltd	RPC website	DD	5.99	1.00
C Stewart	Reimbursement re Zoom subscription	BACS	14.39	2.40
Freeola	Village website	DD	13.86	2.31
Clerk	Salary & expenses	BACS	1,140.72	0.00
J Deacon	Environmental contract	BACS	1,019.10	169.85
Painted Projects	Updating of Honours Board	BACS	160.00	0.00
Woodside Nurseries	Winter planters planted and delivered and extra plants	BACS	275.00	0.00
		TOTAL	5,252.26	227.37

Resolved That the above payments be approved.

116.2 Bank reconciliation as at 31 October 2021

		Bank Accounts		Total £
		Treasurer £	Instant Access £	
Opening funds: 01 April 2021		12,875.04	61,700.80	74,575.84
Movement in funds to date	PLUS Income	87,771.67	3,723.92	91,495.59
	LESS Expenditure	65,950.34	7,634.75	73,585.09
Funds: 31 October 2021		34,696.37	57,789.97	92,486.34

Resolved That the above was a true record.

117. Actual income/expenditure to 31 October 2021 and Draft 2022/23 budget

The Clerk presented a first attempt at the 2022/23 draft budget. The draft budget took account of known costs and also built-in an increased budget allowance for maintenance of the aging play equipment and introduced a new budget line "Projects" which would provide funding for projects from the council's Project Priority list.

The draft budget assumed a 5% increase on the precept, but the council was advised that ESBC had yet to advise whether the Council Tax Support Grant(CTSG) would be paid in 2022/23 and whether SCC would provide funding for cutting grass verges in the Parish.

The draft budget as tabled would see a shortfall between income received and expenditure which would be funded from the General Reserve carried forward at Year End.

The council accepted that there was a continuing, growing need for the council to maintain play equipment, council-owned assets and trees in its ownership and also to meet residents expectations for the village.

The Clerk said that she anticipates that ESBC will have provided confirmation time for the next meeting of the council of the Council Tax Base to be used for 2022/23 and whether the CTSG will be paid.

Agreed that the Clerk be thanked for her work on the draft budget, that the information be noted and that the council bear this in mind when considering the draft budget at the next meeting.

118. Project Priorities

- a) It was noted that the Jinny Trail tree works need to be done this financial year and that there was funding in place for this work. **Agreed** that:
 - Councillor Stewart be authorised to meet with a tree surgeon(s) to advise on what works are required and that quotations be sought for that work.
 - That John Deacon be asked to remove a self-set Ash at the side of the Trail path.
- b) **Agreed** that the ageing timber bus shelter on Knowles Hill be removed from the Priorities List and that it be kept under review and the shelter be removed as and when it is considered to be unsafe.
- c) **Agreed** that a review was required of the trees along the Brook banks on Burnside (see also Minute No. 121).
- d) **Agreed** that the request to plant a tree for HM The Queen's Platinum Jubilee be removed from the Priorities list.
- e) **Agreed** that the area on Meadow View where the donated plum trees are to be planted be named "The Platinum Orchard" in recognition of the HM The Queen's Platinum Jubilee.

119. s106 Working Group

The Notes of the s106 Working Group meeting held on 01 November were received.

Agreed that the council's preferred use of the s106 funds is to fund the indicative cost of additional infant play equipment at Meadow View (43,428 max budget plus VAT), the replacement railing/posts with the two rails, posts spaced at 2m option (£11,753.25 plus VAT) and any residual funds be used to provide replacement wheelie bin stores, picnic tables,

benches, etc. ESBC to be asked if the proposed use of the funds is acceptable under the s106 Agreement so that quotations can be sourced for play equipment, etc.

120. Local Council Climate Action Day Conference

Councillor Scott requested that the council approve his attendance at the above virtual conference at a fee of £30 plus VAT.

The one-day online workshop from the Centre for Sustainable Energy will support Town and Parish Councillors make sense of the scale of the issue and take action in the way that is most appropriate to their area and spheres of influence. It will help Councillors to make the beginning of a practical action plan for their parish or town and be better equipped to address the climate emergency.

Resolved That Councillor Scott be authorised to attend the above conference at a cost of £30 plus VAT.

121. Burnside: Trees on the Brook banks (Minute No. 93.3(c) refers)

Councillors received an update on the attempts made to clarify who is responsible for the bank area adjacent to the Spread Eagle's boundary. ESBC had confirmed that they do not hold this information. The Environment Agency advised that Asset Performance the trees are unlikely to cause an increase in flooding. If a branch or tree fell into the channel, this would cause a risk and Asset Performance would attend site to remove it. Routine maintenance of trees belongs to a private individual in the form of the riparian owner. There does not seem to be a registered owner of the channel according to the Land Registry website. The EA advised that when disputes of this kind have been taken to Court before, very often judges decide that the landowners either side of a river channel actually own to the middle of the channel. That would suggest that the Spread Eagle would be responsible for trees on their side and potentially SCC Highways might be responsible for the trees on the side next to the road.

Agreed That a survey be undertaken once all the leaves have dropped off the trees and that a plan of action be devised and be put to the responsible owners to action. There was also an option to request a meeting with M&B's Estates Officer in an attempt to resolve the situation.

122. Community flood plan (Daft) (2020/21 Minute No. 195 refers)

Councillor Stewart had undertaken to prepare a shorter, two-page document and she sought the council's views on what information should be included.

Agreed that the document should contain contact numbers, the location of sand bins and sand bags with a map.

123. RoSPA Inspection Reports – Findings and Actions

Agreed that John Deacon be requested to advise on what remedial works should be undertaken and to quote for those works.

124. Correspondence

124.1 Staffordshire Parish Councils' Association (SPCA)

The SPCA's weekly newsletters had been circulated to all councillors.

124.2 Communications Log

The weekly Comms Log had been circulated to all councillors.

124.3 ESBC: Polling District Review 2021

Resolved That the document be received without comment.

124.4 **Verges for Wildlife**

Resolved That a request from Sustainability Matters Stafford to publish a survey on the council's Facebook page be declined.

124.5 **Have your say on policing, and fire and rescue in Staffordshire**

Resolved That the communication be received without comment.

124.6 **Broadband service**

A resident had contacted the council regarding the poor broadband service they are receiving from BT. Councillor Stewart reported that a colleague had given technical advice which had been passed onto the resident and that no further contact had been received from them.

124.7 **Police**

The Police had provided a report was circulated to all Councillors at the meeting. It was noted that there was no mention of reports of drug issues in Brook Hollows and the Clerk was requested to advise the Police of this omission.

125. **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

Resolved That under the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960 (Section 2) (and as expended by Section 100 of the Local Government Act 1972), the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information.

105. **Quotations**

RESOLVED That:

a) Replacement posts – Meadow View main area (Minute Nos. 42.3 and 105(a) refer)

This item had been deferred from the previous meeting to enable the existing posts to be inspected – it had been confirmed that the posts do not need to be replaced at this time.

b) Replacement bin surrounds – Tafflands (Minute Nos. 84(b) and 105(b) refer)

This item had been deferred from the previous meeting to enable confirmation of budget availability to be confirmed. The replacement bin surrounds have been added to the list of potential projects to be funded from the s106 funds.

c) Footpath 14 (Beacon Road to Tafflands) (Minute No. 105(c) refers)

This item had been deferred from the previous meeting to enable confirmation of budget availability to be confirmed. This item has been left in abeyance pending confirmation of potential funding through SCC and TTTV.

d) Footpath 14 – Beacon Road end gates (Minute No. 105(d) refers)

This item had been deferred from the previous meeting to enable confirmation of budget availability to be confirmed. This item was deferred again pending the results of an investigation to confirm if an accessible kissing gate can be installed to replace the existing gate.

e) Craythorne Road car park: Locking/Unlocking

The Clerk asked ESBC on 18 October when the current contract was due to be renewed and we were advised that the contract would end on 31 October. ESBC were asked to obtain a quotation for the new contract. Given the quoted cost, comparative quotations were sought and ESBC were asked to arrange for the contract to be extended by two weeks from 01 November to enable the council to decide on what it wanted to do. Quotations were tabled for consideration for an annual contract commencing on 15 November to lock/unlock.

Resolved That J Deacon's quotation in the sum of £5 plus VAT per day (£1,825 pa plus VAT) to lock/unlock the Craythorne Road car park barrier be accepted and that the contract commence on 15 November 2021.

f) Installation of Byelaw sign (access onto Meadow View from Forest School Street)

Resolved That J Deacon's quotation in the sum of £40 plus VAT to site and fix the sign be accepted.

g) Walford Road jitty

Resolved That J Deacon's quotation in the sum of £27 plus VAT to clear nettles, weeds and remove from site be accepted.

h) Access to Meadow View: Footpath from Forest School Street

Resolved That J Deacon's quotation in the sum of £314.00 plus VAT to sort out fence, remove old concrete post, remove slabs, replace with MoT Type 1 stone, etc be accepted.

The meeting closed at 9.45pm

Signed

Date

DRAFT

To: Rolleston-on-Dove Parish Council

30th November 2021

Re: Climate Emergency declaration

Dear Friends

As a result of attending the WALC two-day conference on Climate Change recently, I am motivated to suggest that we should declare a Climate Emergency. This is something that has already been done by more than 80% of the County, Metropolitan and Unitary councils across the UK, and many local councils are now following suit.

I would suggest that it is our responsibility to take this step, and formally declare a climate emergency for our parish. This should then be followed by a process of consultation and public involvement, bringing together as many members of our village as possible, to work together to take effective action to improve our future prospects as a community.

These are the NALC guidelines for future action:

WHAT CAN YOUR LOCAL COUNCIL DO?

- Declare a climate emergency
- Create a task force to establish a green agenda that includes developing a resilience policy and engaging in flood defence measures
- Develop and promote green transport plans, including safe routes to school
- Ensure that all council buildings are as energy-efficient as possible and that energy is not wasted through unnecessary heating and lighting
- Use green energy sources and environmentally friendly products
- Plan for a green community in a neighbourhood plan
- Limit the use of plastics, especially single-use plastics, in your council
- Reduce waste and recycle as much as possible
- Protect important open spaces and carbon sinks and consider creating a community orchard and/or wildflower meadow and/or allotments
- Look at the existing powers of councils regarding climate change

Further information is available:

[List of Councils who have declared a Climate Emergency | Declare a Climate Emergency](#)

[08.03.21.Checklist.SeparatePullOut - Google Docs](#)

[The Global Climate Emergency - The Idiot's Guide to Parish Council Action - YouTube](#)

My earlier suggestions for a Farmers Market and the expansion of our Allotments would, I hope, form part of our Climate Emergency Plan. Ideally, I would like to see a good number of local residents actively involved in planning for the future of our community under a number of different headings: Food, Energy, Transport, Education, Health, Security, etc.

I very much hope you will support this motion, and that we can all work together to create a bright future for all.

Sincerely, Robin Scott

Enclosure 2

ROLLESTON ON DOVE PARISH COUNCIL
ACTUAL INCOME AND EXPENDITURE TO 30 NOVEMBER 2021

Nominal Code	Description	Original Budget £	Projected Year End £	Actual to 30/11/2021 £	
100	Income				
1076	Precept	73,100	73,100	73,100	
1090	Interest Received	6	6	4	
1100	Grants & Donations Received	-	357	220	
1110	Council Tax Support Grant	1,665	1,665	1,665	
1200	Garden rents	125	125	125	
1220	Allotment rents	15	10	10	
1250	Football pitch fees	200	290	290	
1270	SCC: Annual grass cutting	-	4,837	4,837	
1999	Other income	-	40	40	
	Income	75,111	80,430	80,291	

Draft Budget 2022/23 £	
83,459	+£5 on Band D = £59.04 (currently £54.04)
6	
-	
1,665	
125	
15	
200	
3,628	Unknown if this will be paid, SCC sets it budget in February
-	
89,098	

Nominal Code	Description	Original Budget £	Projected Year End £	Actual to 30/11/2021 £	Remaining funds* £
200	Administration				
4000	Staff salary	13,500	17,119	11,060	6,059
4020	Employer's National Insurance	650	1,142	612	530
4030	Payroll Services	80	90	-	90
4050	Use of Home as Office	178	178	119	59
4100	Insurance	3,200	1,106	1,106	2,094
4110	Audit Fees	515	472	472	43
4120	Photocopier: Rental/Maint.	378	378	284	94
4121	Photocopier: Copy charge	670	600	344	326
4125	Stationery	200	200	146	54
4127	Village Directory	150	150	-	150
4130	Postage	300	400	336	64
4140	Council mobile	175	175	101	74
4150	Subscriptions	700	537	537	163
4160	Training	140	405	295	110
4180	Room hire	-	325	125	200
4190	Mileage expenses	250	250	176	74
4195	Parking fees	12	9	3	9
4200	Play areas	7,000	7,000	6,767	233
4205	Craythorne gate: Lock/unlock [#]	700	1,142	-	1,142
4210	RPC Website	100	100	40	60
4211	Village website	45	45	35	10
4220	IT/Software	300	300	258	42
4230	s.137 Expenditure	100	100	67	33
4240	Mowing	17,000	15,000	9,389	7,611
4250	Bin emptying	4,000	3,886	2,915	1,085
4260	Trees	4,000	4,000	1,390	2,610
4265	Plants for planters	600	600	583	17
4270	Environmental contract	13,000	13,000	9,430	3,570
4300	Projects	-	-	-	-
4320	Capital expenditure	800	800	591	209
4330	Other administration	2,000	2,000	1,088	912
4999	Contingency	5,000	5,000	2,959	2,041
	Expenditure	75,743	76,509	51,228	29,768
	TOTAL EXPENDITURE	75,743	76,509	51,228	
	TOTAL INCOME	75,111	80,430	80,291	
	NET INCOME OVER EXPENDITURE	- 632	3,921	29,063	

Draft Budget 2022/23 £	
17,150	Assumes 2% increase
1,090	Includes 1.25% increase for employers
90	
178	
1,106	
500	
378	
600	
200	
150	
400	
175	
600	
500	
425	
250	
9	
10,000	
1,825	
100	
45	
300	
100	
17,000	
4,000	
4,000	
750	
15,000	
10,000	Funding for projects from within the Project Priorities list
800	
2,000	
5,000	Covers potential/unexpected costs, e.g. professional assistance on planning applications
94,721	
94,721	
89,098	
- 5,623	Shortfall would be met from the General Reserve, i.e. funds carried forward at YE

Earmarked Reserves (EMRs)

Coding	Description	Opening funds 01/04/2021 £	Actual funds at 30/11/2021 £	Opening Funds Apr-22 £
4400/320	Environmental improvements	3,902	3,688	?
4410/321	EA funding	7,635	-	-
4420/322	Brook Hollows	10,000	10,000	10,000
4440/325	Play Areas	7,398	3,642	?
4440/326	Andy Starbuck seat (donations)	1,275	1,275	-
	TOTAL	30,210	18,605	10,000

*Remaining funds: based on original budget except for the following Nominal Codes which are based on the revised Projected YE figures:

- 4000 Staff salary
- 4020 Employer's NI
- 4030 Payroll service
- 4130 Postage
- 4160 Training
- 4180 Room hire
- 4205 Craythorne gate: Lock/unlock[#]

[#]4205 Craythorne gate: The final cost for the iD Verde contract will be c£457 for the period 1st April - 14th November 2021. The remainder of the expenditure is the new contract which commenced on 15th November and which will be invoiced monthly.

Rolleston On Dove Parish Council
Risk Assessment as at 13 December 2021

Service Area	Risk	Action/Mitigation
Insurance	Property Damage	Property cover, for year ending 15 June 2022 is adequate and covers all assets as set out on the Asset Register.
	Money	Existing cover is adequate.
	Business interruption	Not covered (not required).
	Public Liability	Existing cover for year ending 15 June 2022 of £10 million is adequate.
	Employers Liability claim	Existing cover for year ending 15 June 2022 of £10 million is adequate.
	Fidelity Guarantee	Existing cover for year ending 15 June 2022 of £150,000 is adequate.
	Libel and Slander	Existing cover for year ending 15 June 2022 of £250,000 is adequate.
	Officials Indemnity	Covered up to £10 million under the council's current Public Liability policy
	Personal Accident	Existing cover for year ending 15 June 2022 of £100,000 is adequate.
	Legal Expenses	Existing cover for year ending 15 June 2022 of £250,000 is adequate.
Accounts and finance	Annual precept too high/too low or not the result of detailed consideration	Continue current system with detailed budget based on past year and current year accounts.
	Protection of monies	The Financial Services Compensation Scheme (FSCS) deposit protection limit is £85,000 per authorised financial institution (not per account). The council is recommended to consider limiting the total amount held with its Bank to £85,000, i.e. invest some of the money held in the Deposit Account in an accessible savings account with another Bank.
	Unlawful expenditure	Follow Financial Regulations as reviewed by Council May 2020. Follow advice of Clerk/RFO that all expenditure is within legal powers.
	Unauthorised expenditure	Report all payments to Council for approval (even if already paid). Cheque signatories to initial cheque stubs and invoices.
	Accounts not reconciled	Bank reconciliation presented to each monthly council meeting.
	Non-standard and/or non-compliant records kept	Follow Financial Regulations as reviewed by Council March 2021. Accept advice from Clerk/RFO and Internal and External auditors.
	Non-compliance with statutory requirements for completion / approval / submission of accounts and other financial returns	Ensure that all accounts and returns are completed and submitted by the deadlines.

	Non-compliance with transparency code requirements	Review process in line with requirements.
	Non-compliance with internal audit requirements	Appoint Internal Auditor.
	Loss of computer-based accounting records	Records backed-up onto portable external hard drive monthly.
Staff	Loss of key personnel through ill health or leaving	Council could cover short-term absence while replacement found. Immediately advertise any vacancy. Appoint locum clerk if necessary.
Delegation of Authority	Inability to deal with urgent matters during an emergency	Standing Order 18 adopted on 11 May 2020 giving the Clerk delegated authority to deal with urgent matters during an emergency.
Administration	Inadequate access to advice	Continue memberships of SPCA/NALC and SLCC.
	Loss of hard document records	Records maintained in Clerk's home. Photocopies to be stored off-site for key records.
	Loss of computer-based records	Records backed-up onto portable external hard drive monthly.
Council-owned land and play areas	Accident arising from unsafe areas and resultant public liability claim	Weekly visual inspection of site and play equipment by the council's contractor. Clerk has delegated powers to order remedial works in case of damage or health and safety matters.
Noticeboards	May require repairs/become unsafe	Boards checked regularly when notices are posted.
Contractors	Activities of uninsured contractor could give rise to public liability claim	Council to check on contractors' Indemnity insurance and working practices. Contractors must have at least £5 million Public Liability insurance.
	Unsafe working practices by a contractor appointed by the council	

This risk assessment was prepared on 02 December 2021 and approved by the Council on 13 December 2021.

Mary Danby
Proper Officer

This risk assessment will be reviewed annually.

CHALLENGE OF CLIMATE CHANGE

Staffordshire County Council posted on 10 Nov 2021 that funds are available for communities to tackle climate change or protect the environment. £100,000 pot.

“Projects that reduce carbon impact, improve air quality, enhance green spaces or reduce waste are likely to be considered for funding.

The county council funding is open to not-for profit organisations including.....parish councils Staffordshire CC’s cabinet member for environment, infrastructure and climate change, Simon Tagg is urging groups to make an application to the fund.”

He said:

“Tackling climate change remains one of the county council’s top priorities and we have a target to reach net zero by 2050.”We are committed to tackling climate change and we know that if we all come together and do our bit, including voluntary and community groups, we can make a big difference. Through this fund, each county councillor has £1,500 to give out in their area and can allocate up to £500 per project. “The funding is being allocated on a first come first served basis, so I would urge community groups to speak to their local councillor, check if they are eligible and make an application.”

PROPOSAL FOR FUNDING AND/OR AN ANNUAL ROLLESTON PC COMMITMENT:

1. COMPOST BINS
2. WATER BUTTS
3. TREE PURCHASE

Background to waste:

In England in 2019 [source: UK Gov Stats website] total waste from homes/households was 22.1m tonnes [22.0m tonnes in 2018]. Or 392kg per person.

2.2m tonnes of England local authority waste was **disposed in landfill** or 8.5%.

Based on 3500 residents, and the English average of 392kg waste/person, Rolleston could have had 1,372,000 kg of waste collected from its homes. If Staffs CC also landfills 8.5%, 116,620 kg or 18,364 stone [in old money] or the equivalent of 1,224 x 15 stone residents a year.

1. **Compost bins**

To purchase using the Fund [say £500], and maybe offer this annually as an agreed Rolleston PC budget item, and after consultation/village canvassing/Facebook advertising/Rollestonian/? maybe 20 compost bins on a first come first served/agreed commitment to take one.

ESBC promote compost bins:



Consider buying a home composter and compost your food and garden waste at home. We've teamed up with www.getcomposting.com to offer good value home compost bins.



Blackwall 330 litre Black Compost Converter

£12.50

Voted best "BUDGET BUY" in Gardeners' World Magazine. With over three million sold to date, the Blackwall Compost Converter is the **UK's best-selling** home compost bin. Providing a secure environment for compost, this converter retains heat and moisture. **Made out of recycled plastic**, the Blackwall 330 Litre Black Compost Converter is UV stabilised to prevent any degradation. The Blackwall 330 Litre Black Compost Converter is made in the UK with a **7-year guarantee**, and has an extra wide hatch for easy access, requiring no assembly. Also available in 220 litre size.

20 x £12.50 = £250 [delivery £6.99 per order so better to order in one go if demand is confirmed]

2. **Water Butts**

From the same firm via ESBC – any saving on water is a positive.



Mini Rainsaver 100 litre Green Water Butt Kit = £28.98 [200 litre = £37.99]. £6.99 del charge

Just on 5 being ordered cost c£144.90 + £6.99 delivery charge = £151.89.....cumulative spend £401.89.

3. **Trees** c£100 spend

Planting trees – larger, more for farmers/landowners of size willing to plant with no PC responsibility but worth the question; or maybe fruit/smaller garden trees.

Woodland Trust

If you do, you can get started with a Woodland Trust tree pack. If you thought your garden was too small for trees, or if you don't know which trees to buy, The Woodland Trust's shop has a wide selection of tree and hedge packs to plant everywhere from urban gardens to large tracts of land. The smallest packs contain four saplings and cost £12.95.

Wild wood tree pack

These hardy trees are ideally suited to exposed, wet land.

From £115.00 [105 seedlings] These trees are cell-grown saplings, ranging from approximately 15cm-60cm in height.

TRESDIRECT.CO.UK

Examples: 1 x 1.5 to 1.75m [5 foot] saplings = Copper Beech £60 , Silver Birch £52.50
30-50 cms [1 foot-1.5 feet] Oak tree £24.75 all incl. VAT ...say buy 4 = £500.89

Cllr Simon Appleby

Rolleston on Dove Parish Council
13 December 2021

Agenda item no. 16
Training opportunities for Councillors

Breakthrough Communications are offering the following training opportunities through the Staffordshire Parish Councils' Association (SPCA). Each course is delivered remotely via Zoom at a cost of £30 per delegate:

Course Title	Date/Time
Building a two-way conversation with the wider community	Tuesday 11 January 2pm – 4pm Or Friday 18 February 11am – 1pm
How to effectively engage with young people in your community	Wednesday 19 January 10am – 12 noon
Recruiting new councillors: strategies and tactics to find new people	Thursday 13 January 1pm – 3pm Or Tuesday 13 February 10am – 12 noon
Social media skills for councillors	Thursday 27 January 7pm – 9pm
Data protection for councillors	Tuesday 25 January 6.30pm – 8.30pm
Equality and diversity within your council	Thursday 27 January 12 noon – 2pm Or Friday 8 April 10am – 12 noon

Barton under Needwood Parish Council
Village Hall, Crowberry Lane, Barton under Needwood
Burton upon Trent, Staffordshire. DE13 8AF
Tel: 01283 716059
Email: clerk@bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk
www.bartonunderneedwood-pc.gov.uk



12 November 2021

Clerk to Parish Councils of
Abbots Bromley, Tutbury, Rocester and Rolleston

Dear all

Conservation Areas

For some time, Barton Parish Council's Planning Committee has been concerned about decisions made by the Borough Council in determining planning applications in the Conservation Area. We recently took up the invitation from Cllr Allen who is the Borough Council's Deputy Leader for Regeneration and Planning Policy to talk to him about various issues. We raised these conservation area issues with him. Whilst he listened, we did not feel that we either received a helpful response or indeed any desire to investigate further. As a result of that rather less than enthusiastic response, we decided that we had better set out our concerns more formally in writing to ESBC.

The thought occurred to us that if we are having concerns about issues in the conservation area, then other Parishes may also be experiencing something similar. Before we write to ESBC, we thought it would be useful to contact your Parish Council to ascertain your views and experiences. If there is some form of consensus of opinions, then we would hope that a collaborative approach to ESBC might carry greater weight. We are concerned about both the fabric and the quality of the conservation area as well as questioning how planning decisions are derived. Some context for our concerns is perhaps required.

Background – Conservation Area Quality and Appraisals

In 2009 English Heritage (now Historic England), undertook the first major survey of Conservation Areas in the country. It found that the main threats to conservation areas were :-

- ***plastic windows and doors;***
- ***poorly maintained roads and pavements;***
- ***street clutter;***
- ***loss of front garden walls, fences and hedges;***
- ***unsightly satellite dishes;***
- ***effects of traffic calming and management;***
- ***alterations to the fronts, roofs and chimneys of buildings;***
- ***unsympathetic extensions;***
- ***impact of advertisements; and***
- ***neglected green spaces.***

Clerk to the Council: Mrs Siobhan Rumsby
Office Hours: Monday 10am-12pm; Wednesday 1pm–3pm; Thursday 1pm-3pm

Enclosure 7

English Heritage put forward three main recommendations to tackling this gradual deterioration of the fabric of conservation areas. They wanted:-

- (1) councils to make use of Article 4 Directions to protect small but important details such as windows and doors and front gardens. English Heritage felt that if you lose these then you lose the character and history that made the area special. (For those who are unfamiliar with this term, we explain what Article 4 Directions are in more detail below);**
- (2) council departments to work together to take better care of public areas. Counties and Districts needed to work together to save public areas from further decay;**
- (3) local people to get involved. The survey showed that conservation areas with community support are more than twice as likely to have improved than those without. The survey also showed that people felt that original features added value to a property and that a well-kept conservation area enhanced house prices.**

With ten years or so of austerity and cutbacks to local authority funding, we can only have sympathy for local authorities but, as a consequence, we can only believe that the quality of conservation areas has deteriorated further. ESBC has also been hit by cutbacks in resources in terms of staffing levels in the planning department. We understand, for example, that they have the services of a Conservation Officer for only a day or so a week. This probably provides enough time to respond to appropriate planning applications and but no time for proactive work.

As you may be aware, local authorities have a duty, from time to time, to undertake an appraisal of their conservation areas. Barton's Appraisal was completed in February 2009, but we notice others were undertaken in 2015. Looking on ESBC's website we note that Rolleston's dates back to 2007, so that time might be coming around to review some if not all of these Appraisals. An appraisal provides an assessment of the quality of the area and identifies local styles and details and, if you like identifies, the good, the bad and the ugly. But it only tells you half the story because the next follow-up stage should be a Management Plan setting out what you can do to address the problems and issues identified in the Appraisal. The preparation of such proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the conservation area is also a duty on the local authority. As far as we are aware, there have been no Management Plans prepared in East Staffordshire.

For those who are not familiar with the term, an Article 4(1) Direction of the General Development Order can be applied to non-listed buildings to restrict their permitted development rights. A similar Article 4(2) Direction can be applied to dwelling houses.

The Government has moved the goalposts for designating Article 4 Directions in the National Planning Policy Framework July 2021. Para. 53 states that, "**..... they should be limited to situations where..... it is necessary to protect local amenity or the well-being of the area. In all cases, it must be based on robust evidence and apply to the smallest geographical area possible**". This makes making an Article 4 Direction more difficult but, we would suggest, not impossible provided there is good justification. We find it quite strange that more than 10 years ago, English Heritage, the body tasked with promoting the well-being of historic England, was positively endorsing and encouraging the use of Article 4 Directions as a means of addressing the decline in the fabric of conservation areas and yet the present Government is making designation more difficult. We have to ponder, therefore, how

conservation areas are to be improved if there is no funding and a recommended means of protecting the fabric and preventing decline is being made difficult to implement.

Planning Decisions

What has really prompted this letter is our lack of comprehension at some of the decisions which ESBC has made and how they relate to the need to preserve and enhance the conservation area.

Case Studies - Plastic vs Wooden windows and doors

A pub in the village had replaced ground floor frontage elevation wooden windows with plastic ones. It submitted a retrospective application. This application also included the replacement of five other wooden windows with plastic including the first floor. The pub is in a prominent location at a mini roundabout in the village. We objected on the grounds that approval would be contrary to other decisions made nearby where wooden frames had been required. We also felt that the replacement plastic frames were not in keeping with the appearance of the building.

The Conservation Officer's comments stated that. ***“The replacement of the first-floor windows in addition to the ground floor windows would result in a more holistic replacement and secures consistency, removing the easy opportunity to compare new and old directly and alongside each other”***. As a result of these comments the Case Officer's report stated, ***“This application seeks to retain the replacement windows and replace the other windows to provide some consistency in design on the front and side elevations of the building which is visible from public vantage points within the conservation area and from nearby listed buildings. The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the character of the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings”***.

We remain at a loss to understand the logic of this decision. We had always assumed that, in conservation areas, wooden windows and doors would always be preferred to plastic and that this preference would be supported by Conservation Officers. But here we have a case where the desire for consistency overrules the quality of the conservation area. If consistency was the main criterion then why could not all windows be wood, when as in this case the opportunity was available to achieve this?

In another case, consistency did not appear to be of concern. Planning approval was given for the conversion of a ground floor shop to residential use. This involved the installation of a substantial plastic window in the front elevation which was more or less a straight replacement for the shop window. Subsequently the applicants replaced the front doors with upvc versions. From the information supplied by the applicants it seems that ESBC requested that a retrospective planning application be made but with wooden rather than plastic doors and this was approved.

Why was a wooden door required when a very prominent plastic frontage window was deemed acceptable? Ironically, the applicant's Heritage Statement noted that new hardwood doors will respond to the sensitive design requirements of the Conservation Area and that, ***“..... traditional materials such as wood would create a great addition to the street scene”***. ESBC's decision to allow a plastic window doesn't make sense to us. It clearly goes against the English Heritage survey which viewed the installation of plastic rather than wood as a reflection of the deterioration of conservation area quality.

Clerk to the Council: Mrs Siobhan Rumsby
Office Hours: Monday 10am-12pm; Wednesday 1pm-3pm; Thursday 1pm-3pm

Historic England's guide, 'Traditional Windows, their care, repair and upgrading, 2017', stated that, "**Replacement plastic windows pose one of the greatest threats to the heritage value of historic areas, particularly in towns and villages.....The different appearance in character of PVC-u windows compared to historic windows is highly likely to make them unsuitable for older buildings, particularly listed buildings or in conservation areas**". This exhortation would seem to indicate that there is, at least, an obligation to try and maintain, repair and replace wooden windows. Against this guidance, we are still at a loss to understand why the desire for consistency should overrule quality.

As we understand it the planning position is that you do not need planning permission to change your windows in a conservation area if you live in a single dwelling house, as this is part of your permitted development rights. If you live in a flat or above a shop, or other commercial premise then you do need permission. Permission for replacement windows in a listed building is always required. The effect of an Article 4 Direction takes away permitted development rights meaning that if you want to replace wood with plastic you would be required to apply for permission.

Case Study – rear extensions in conservation areas

We recently commented on a planning application for a rear extension for a property in Main Street in the heart of the conservation area. The property, although not listed, made a major contribution to the character of this part of Main Street. The existing rear elevation has the feel of a cottage with a pitched roof extension and a stable door. The rear windows are small and confirmed this cottage feel. What was proposed and now approved was a full width single storey flat roof extension in a contemporary style with black aluminium framed windows and patio doors. In its favour the materials to be used were reclaimed bricks. We objected to the proposal as we felt that a flat roof extension, using contemporary aluminium rather than wood, was out of character and as a consequence contrary to Policies SP 24, SP 25 and DP 6. The applicants also made no reference to the ESBC Design Guide. We also asked that the proposal be referred to the Design Review Panel as permitted under Policy SP 24, but this request was ignored.

The applicants, in their Heritage Statement, made the argument that as the rear extension was not visible from the public realm then the proposals will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Planning Officer's report endorsed this approach, "***The ESBC Conservation Officer has raised no objections to the proposal conclude that the proposal would have no perceivable impact upon the special character and appearance of the conservation area due to it not being visible within the public realm. Additionally the proposal is considered to preserve the special significant of nearby buildings. The proposals are therefore considered to have no impact on the significance of heritage assets (sic)***"

There are a number of issues here. We have read a several of these case officer reports where the implication is that if you cannot see an extension then it doesn't really matter. We find this approach both worrying and difficult to understand. As far as we are aware, the conservation area relates to an area. Whilst in most cases the boundary is drawn fairly tightly, it does include property curtilages and not just frontages. We further understand that Local Plan Policies SP 25 Historic Environment and DP 6 Protecting the Historic Environment refer to the need to protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets which surely means the conservation area as a whole. We can find no reference in these policies that the frontage of the buildings, only, should be protected and that rear extensions are of no consequence in protecting, conserving and enhancing the conservation area. Similarly, there is no reference in

the planning policies about proposals being acceptable if they cannot be seen from the public realm. There is certainly no reference to this criterion in the National Planning Policy Framework July 2021. We are, therefore, at a loss to understand where this use of the public realm comes from.

In an earlier discussion with a Planning Manager we were informed that case law had established that 'preserving' meant doing no harm. In this instance we felt that harm had been done because of the inappropriate design. But be that as it may, the local plan policies seek to do more than just preserve. They also aim to 'protect' and 'enhance'. Enhancing to our minds means making something better. In this case we could not see how demolishing a pitch roof and replacing it with a flat roof extension could improve and enhance. It just seems that ESBC places greater emphasis on the negative aspect of doing no harm rather than a proposal having to make a positive contribution.

Case Study – Demolition

A part of the comprehensive redevelopment of the rear of a property fronting Main Street involved the demolition of what was an old former small cottage, which was admittedly in a sorry state. Policy DP 5 allows for demolition in conservation areas but only where it can be demonstrated that it would protect and enhance the character and appearance and setting of the conservation area. The proposal consisted of a more contemporary design with an abundance of glass. What worried the Parish Council in this case was that ESBC made no attempt to assess whether the building could have been saved, regenerated and incorporated as part of the proposal. Instead the officer's report stated that, ***"It is not considered that this building is an important heritage asset and indeed its dilapidated nature detracts somewhat from the overall character of the conservation area....."***. Of course, the dilapidated nature affected the character, but no one seemed to be putting forward the case for protecting and enhancing. We felt that, again, this just demonstrated a lack of concern for the quality and fabric of the conservation area.

We apologise for the length of this letter but felt that it was necessary if we were to explain not just the context of our concerns but also the detail in terms of the case studies we referred to.

We would very much appreciate your thoughts and comments and, perhaps, you would be kind enough to inform us about your experience. Do you feel there has been a noticeable decline in the quality of your conservation area? If so, then what would you attribute that to? Do you, for example, recognise the issues raised in the EH Survey of 2009? Do you feel that applicants take account of the Appraisal? Would the preparation of a Management Plan be helpful? Do think that there is a role for Article 4 Directions? Do you, generally, favour wood rather than plastic doors and windows? Have you had similar concerns to ours regarding the attitude of ESBC to extensions that can't be seen?

In order to provide evidence to support this letter it would be very helpful if you could provide us with your own case studies or any concerns or indeed similar examples. Please let us know the planning application references and the reasons behind your objections accordingly so that we can read the details and the Case Officer Reports. We would then aim to include them in a collaborative letter to ESBC with your endorsement.

It is our intention to write to ESBC along the lines we have set out in this letter. Please let us know if you would be happy to support this approach and we can then decide, from a practical point of view, on how we can best make a submission to ESBC.

Clerk to the Council: Mrs Siobhan Rumsby
Office Hours: Monday 10am-12pm; Wednesday 1pm-3pm; Thursday 1pm-3pm

Enclosure 7

If you do not really have any concerns about the conservation area, then thank your time in reading thus far. Perhaps you could let us know your reasoning?

We are sending this letter to the four main villages in the Borough, rather than to all parishes with a conservation area. This is purely from a pragmatic point of view as we would wish to make a submission in a timely manner. We would, therefore, be very grateful for your early consideration and response to this letter. You may also recall that these parishes undertook some collaborative work during the preparation of the Local Plan. It might also be helpful, for future reference, to exchange contact details of Chairs of Planning Committees.

Yours faithfully

I Gilbey

Cllr Ian Gilbey
Chairman Planning Committee
Barton Under Needwood Parish Council

TUTBURY PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Karen Duffill

9 PINFOLD CLOSE
TUTBURY BURTON UPON
TRENT STAFFORDSHIRE

Telephone:
07486 406045

clerk@tutbury.staffslc.gov.uk
www.tutburyparishcouncil.co.uk

TMonday, 06 December 2021

Dear Parish Council

Closure of Lloyds bank at Tutbury

I am writing on behalf of Tutbury Parish Council regarding the forthcoming closure of the bank, a valuable community asset. The proposed closure date is March 2022. Our parishioners use this branch as opposed to travelling to Burton on Trent.

The bank is a vital lifeline in the village for customer who cannot use technology to do their banking online, especially the elderly , who may not have access to travel to Burton to do their banking. The branch is well used by not only Tutbury residents, but residents from surrounding areas, because of the excellent service and friendly staff. There is not another local bank in the area without travelling into a town. By loosing the bank there will be no access to a cash machine in the village.

To lose this branch would be a loss to the village; not just in the service it provides, but to the trade its visiting customers brings to the High Street businesses. Whilst Lloyds have attempted to signpost customers to alternative services, it is clear that in order t to conduct the same financial operations, their customers will have to spend time and money, often for a lesser or reduced service. Local businesses use the bank, and the closure will have a negative impact on conducting their business in the future.

The Parish Council want to echo the concerns of our parishioners and will be submit a complaint and if it is closed, request a mobile banking service. We would like to gain support from our neighbouring parishes to enable us to escalate the loss of a vital community service to our higher levels of government.

Could we please ask for your written response to support our complaint, so we can lobby the government to intervene and regulate commercial decisions that have such a detrimental impact by removing access to cash machines and banking services for local communities. We would also like to encourage you to submit your own complaint and request for mobile baking. Could you encourage your parishioners to do the same? A collective voice will have much more impact on the decision.

Thank you for your co-operation in this matter and we will look forward to your response.

Yours Faithfully



Karen Duffill Clerk