# Minutes of a meeting of Rolleston on Dove Parish Council held at the Old Grammar School Room, Church Road on Monday 11 July 2022 commencing at 7.30pm

## Present

Councillor Stewart (in the Chair) Councillors Appleby, Houston, E McManus, S McManus, Robson, Scott and Sharples

## In attendance

Evie Hetherington, Youth Representative Mary Danby, Clerk John Widdowson and Stefanie White, Burton Albion Community Trust Six members of the public

# Burton 10K

Stephanie White gave information regarding the Burton 10K which will take place on Sunday 09 October which will be a closed road 10K running event starting and finishing at the Pirelli Stadium. Ms White updated the council on their plans for road closures, environmental impact and their plans to communicate to residents and local services.

Councillor Stewart advised that BACT should liaise with Staffordshire Highways who would be undertaking reconstruction works on Station Road for 6-8 weeks from 19 September (planned start date).

## Public Forum

The members of the public expressed their concerns regarding P/2019/00131.

## 39. Apologies

Councillors Badcock, Sanderson and Toon had tendered apologies for absence.

# 40. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

None declared.

# 41. Planning matters

# 41.2 Planning applications

**Resolved** That the following observations be submitted to ESBC:

Application No.	Location	Proposal
P/2019/00131	Land adjacent to	Outline application for up to 18 dwellings including
	97 Station Road	10 affordable dwellings and details of access
		(UPDATED FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT RECEIVED)

Objection on the following grounds:

- The site is outside the village settlement boundary.
- The proposed development is not within the NDP.
- The housing survey referred to in the application documentation originally proved a need, however this was pre-College Fields development. The housing need identified in the Rolleston on Dove Neighbourhood Development Plan has been met by the College Fields development.
- ESBC is well above the 5 year housing numbers requirement stipulated by Government.
- The site is on a flood plain and should not be built on.
- As acknowledged in the revised Flood Risk Assessment (Executive Summary, page iii), Station Road
  properties will be at risk from flooding by fluvial and surface water which will go into existing
  storm drains which are already at capacity.
- The proposed development is contrary to the Rolleston on Dove Neighbourhood Development Plan (Policies H1 (Housing development), D2 (Design of new development) and OS1 (Protection of views of local importance).
- There will be a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties which will be overlooked by the proposed dwellings.
- The Parish Council is considering taking advice from a planning consultant to review the application.

 The Ward Borough Councillor has been requested to call the application in for consideration / decision by the Planning Committee.

In view of these strong reasons for rejection, the significant local objections raised to us by residents and the difficulty of preparing responses due to lack of clear revision history in the Revised Flood Risk Assessment document and the planning application history, the Parish Council ask that this application be refused.

P/2021/01020	Land adjacent to	Outline application for the erection of up to 40		
	374a Tutbury Road	dwellings (28 first homes and 12 affordable		
		rented) including details of access (REVISED DESCRIPTION)		
The Parish Counc	il supports the applicant's pr			
		es within the application site, and		
	e existing TRO for 30mph pas			
	<b>0 1</b>			
P/2022/00476	Lodge Cottage	Listed Building Consent for the installation of a		
	2 Brookside	new gas supply, boiler, flue and ground meter box		
No objection				
P/2022/00539	12 Marston Lane	Demolition of existing garage and erection of a		
		single storey front extension and porch, two		
		storey side extension and rear extension and flue		
		pipe to side elevations		
Clarification soug		e sufficient off street parking, as set out in ESBC's Parking		
Standards SPD?				
	3 Oak Trees Close	Retention of temporary single storey wetroom		
P/2022/00644	3 Oak Trees Close	Retention of temporary single storey wetroom pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled		
	3 Oak Trees Close	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled		
P/2022/00644		pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob		pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled		
P/2022/00644		pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required.	jection on the condition that	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651		pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required.	jection on the condition that	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection	jection on the condition that	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer Erection of a single storey rear extension		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection P/2022/00657	jection on the condition that	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection	jection on the condition that	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer Erection of a single storey rear extension		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection P/2022/00657 No objection	jection on the condition that 2 Beacon Drive 93 Hall Road	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult         the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer         Erection of a single storey rear extension         Proposed single storey side extension		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection P/2022/00657	jection on the condition that	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult         the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer         Erection of a single storey rear extension         Proposed single storey side extension         Loft conversion with front pitched roof dormer		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection P/2022/00657 No objection P/2022/00662	jection on the condition that 2 Beacon Drive 93 Hall Road 7 Meadow Fields	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult         the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer         Erection of a single storey rear extension         Proposed single storey side extension         Loft conversion with front pitched roof dormer windows and rear roof windows		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection P/2022/00657 No objection P/2022/00662 Clarification soug	jection on the condition that 2 Beacon Drive 93 Hall Road 7 Meadow Fields	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult         the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer         Erection of a single storey rear extension         Proposed single storey side extension         Loft conversion with front pitched roof dormer		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection P/2022/00657 No objection P/2022/00662	jection on the condition that 2 Beacon Drive 93 Hall Road 7 Meadow Fields	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult         the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer         Erection of a single storey rear extension         Proposed single storey side extension         Loft conversion with front pitched roof dormer windows and rear roof windows		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection P/2022/00657 No objection P/2022/00662 Clarification soug Standards SPD?	jection on the condition that 2 Beacon Drive 93 Hall Road 7 Meadow Fields th: Does the proposal provid	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult         the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer         Erection of a single storey rear extension         Proposed single storey side extension         Loft conversion with front pitched roof dormer windows and rear roof windows         e sufficient off street parking, as set out in ESBC's Parking		
P/2022/00644 Comment: No ob required. P/2022/00651 No objection P/2022/00657 No objection P/2022/00662 Clarification soug	jection on the condition that 2 Beacon Drive 93 Hall Road 7 Meadow Fields	pod to the rear of the property for use by disabled adult         the temporary wetroom pod is removed when no longer         Erection of a single storey rear extension         Proposed single storey side extension         Loft conversion with front pitched roof dormer windows and rear roof windows		

# 42. Minutes

**Resolved** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2022 be approved and signed as a true record.

# 43. Matters arising

## Minute No. 29.8, third bullet point re Footpath 14

Councillor Stewart reported that the landowners were not adverse to some improvements on the site and they had requested a meeting with one or two councillors and the council's contractor.

## 44. County Councillor's report

Councillor White had advised that Station Road would be resurfaced and the work would take 6-8 weeks to complete, starting on 19 September. The Highways team would also move the Dovecliff Road build-out whilst they were in the village. He also expressed concern about the flood risk arising from the development on land adjacent to 97 Station Road and said that Staffordshire Highways had not been consulted on the proposed plateau.

#### 45. Borough Councillor's report

Councillor Toon had advised that the spread of Covid was of concern; ESBC were waiting to see if funding will be cut following the Prime Minister developments following Boris Johnson MP's resignation.

#### 46. Parish Councillors' reports

- 46.1 Councillor Houston referred to Health and Safety issues arising from the handling of materials brought on HGV vehicles to the former Rolleston Service Station site and that he would personally raise his concerns with the Health and Safety Executive.
- 46.2 Councillor Appleby said that the bird deterrent spikes on the Elizabeth Avenue swings frame had been removed. The council felt that the expense in replacing the spikes on a regular basis could not be justified, however the contractor may have a cheaper solution by using cable ties and he was to be asked to trial this method.

He noted that stone filled gabions had been put into the water at Brook Hollows.

- 46.3 Councillor Sharples reported that she had recently undertaken the Councillor Fundamentals training session. She also reported that the Youth Representative had joined her on her recent inspection walk of her Area of Responsibility.
- 46.4 Councillor E McManus reported that a To Let board had appeared at the junction of Shotwood Close/Church Road the Clerk will write to the Estate Agents and ask that the board be removed as soon as possible.
- 46.5 Councillor S McManus noted that the Cricket Club had secured sponsorship from Bellway Homes.
- 46.6 Councillor Stewart reported that:
  - Councillor Badcock had circulated information about the extension to the solar farm park proposal, Tutbury. **Agreed** that the information be noted.
  - She had been given some Foxgloves which would be planted on the Jinny Trail and Tafflands.
  - All the successful compost bin applicants had been contacted and bins were being collected by them.
  - Councillor Sanderson had met with the contractors about the proposed bus shelter on Church Road, opposite the Hall Road junction. Permits were in the process of being sought and information had been sent to County Councillor White and he would liaise with County Officers about any arrangements that may be necessary during the construction works.
  - The Amey Site Manager had contacted the council asking for permission to use the Craythorne Road playing field car park as a temporary compound during the Station Road resurfacing works. The council agreed to the request in principle and the Chair was authorised to liaise with the Site Manager on what could be offered in recompense to the village for the free use of the car park.

# 47. Financial Matters

# 47.1 Schedule of payments

Payee	Description	Payment Method	Gross £	VAT £
Clerk	Reimbursement: 32 No. compost bins	BACS	606.99	101.16
IONOS Cloud Ltd	RPC website	DD	5.99	1.00
David Ogilvie Engineering Ltd	1 No. Queen's Platinum Jubilee seat	BACS	1,412.40	235.40
Sign Craft	2 No. warning signs for the Jinny Trail	BACS	168.00	28.00
Staffordshire Parish Councils' Association	Councillor Fundamentals training fee (1 delegate)	BACS	30.00	0.00
P Gould	Mowing contract	BACS	1,171.07	0.00
Clerk	Salary and expenses	BACS	1,184.51	0.00
J Deacon	Environmental Contract £1,058.64 Lock/unlock Craythorne barrier £180.00 Install Queen's Platinum Jubilee bench on The Croft £420.00	BACS	1,658.64	276.44
Hardy Signs Ltd	Byelaws signs	BACS	73.20	12.20
ESBC	Bin emptying (2 <sup>nd</sup> qtr)	BACS	1223.08	203.85
Viking	Postage stamps £95.00, delivery £3.48	BACS	98.48	0.58
P Gould	Jinny Trail: Spray weedkiller on both sides of the path	BACS	95.00	0.00
02	Council mobile	DD	18.35	3.06
		TOTALS	7,745.71	861.69

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

# 47.2 Bank reconciliation at 30 June 2022

		Bank Accounts			
		Treasurer	Instant Access	Total	
		£	£	£	
01 April 2022	Bank Statement	8,574.16	100,698.22	109,272.38	
	PLUS	56,650.70	1,310.87	57,961.57	
Movement in funds to date	Income	50,050.70	1,510.87	57,901.57	
	LESS	24 570 70		24 570 70	
	Expenditure	21,578.70	-	21,578.70	
30 June 2022	Bank Statement	43,646.16	102,009.09	145,655.25	

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

# 47.3 Earmarked Reserves

**Resolved** That the council's Earmarked Reserves (EMRs) at 30 June 2022 were:

		Opening funds 01/04/2022 £	Movement in funds to date £	Available funds as at 30/06/2022 £
Environmental improvements		3,111.39	(304.00)	2,807.39
Brook Hollows		50,000.00	0.00	50,000.00
Play areas		3,642.00	0.00	3,642.00
Andy Starbuck seat		351.00	(351.00)	0.00
s106 College Fields		0.00	11,753.25	11,753.25
	Total	57,104.39	11,098.25	68,202.64

# 48. Actual income/expenditure to 30 June 2022 Resolved That the report be noted.

## 49. Correspondence

49.1 Staffordshire Parish Councils' Association (SPCA)

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

## 49.2 Communications Log

The Comms Logs had been circulated to all councillors.

## 49.3 Rolleston Civic Trust: Request for permission to use RPC land for a car boot sale

The Trust were looking to hold a car boot sale in the village at the end of the summer. They were looking to hold it somewhere local to the village and were looking for the support of the Parish Council. They suggested that the locations that would lend themselves to hosting the event would be either the Elizabeth Avenue play area, The Croft or the Craythorne Road football pitches.

**Resolved** That the Rolleston Civic Trust be permitted to hold a Car Boot sale on the Elizabeth Avenue playing field.

## 49.4 Police report

The June statistics report had been circulated to all councillors.

# 49.5 **Staffordshire County Council:**

#### TR12/22 Dovecliff Road, Rolleston on Dove

The council had been invited to comment on the above permanent Traffic Regulation Order for a new traffic calming feature (buildout) along the southern footway on Dovecliff Road to start at the end of the existing keep clear marking across the access to property no.42 and extend by approximately 4.4m in a westerly direction.

Agreed That the council did not wish to comment on the above Traffic Regulation Order.

# 49.6 Staffordshire County Council: Craythorne Road car park – replacement railings project

Staffordshire County Council had forwarded the supplier's revised quotation for the supply only of the materials to replace the railings between the car park and the playing field. The revised quotation was £10,575.68 plus VAT (the original quotation was £11,393.25 plus VAT). A 16 week lead time for delivery had been advised. The Clerk liaised with the Chair and Vice Chair and authority was given for the order to be placed (the order was placed on 07 July) – the council was requested to retrospectively approve this action.

As previously agreed, Staffordshire County Council will remove the existing railings and install the new railings free of charge in recognition of their being given permission to use the car park for a temporary compound during the Beacon Road works.

**Resolved** That the placing of the order for the supply only of materials for the replacement railings project, as set out above, be retrospectively approved.

# 50. 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.

The Youth Representative left the meeting.

# 51. S106 Funds: Proposed extension to the existing Meadow View play area (LGA 1972, Schedule 12A, Part 1, para. 2 – Exempt information)

The Chair opened the discussion by reminding the council that this proposal was for an extension to an existing play area offering inclusive equipment for children aged 2-10 years; that the s106 funds are given to the village to be spent in the vicinity of the development and that the council had looked at its existing play equipment to enhance the facility.

The council considered a report which detailed that:

- **1.** ESBC had confirmed that planning permission will be required to extend the existing play area.
- 2. References for Playdale Playgrounds had been received.
- **3.** The public consultation period had run from 21 June 05 July. Councillors noted that the consultation information published on the council's website and Facebook page had been viewed by well over 1500 people. The information had also been shared and it had been publicised through numerous village organisations and displayed on the village noticeboards. The full text of a total of 20 responses and one query had been received and were considered by Councillors (six emails, 14 comments on Facebook and one telephone query) and Councillors considered the following (summarised) comments:
  - a) The proposed extension will see an increase in parking Response: The proposed extension is aimed at providing inclusive play equipment for children aged 2-10 years, it is not thought that this would result in significant parking on Meadow View.
  - b) Could the existing play areas on Forest School Street and Garrick Square be extended/refurbished instead of extending the Meadow View play area? Response: These two play areas are owned and maintained by ESBC, not the Parish Council.
  - c) Could the footpaths to access Meadow View from Forest School Street/College Fields be linked up and drainage improved to prevent it getting muddy? Response: This could be considered as a potential future project.
  - d) Has there been requests for the play area to be extended? Response: The council is aware that younger children's needs are not met by the existing play area and none of the existing equipment is inclusive.
  - e) The current play area needs redesigning and younger children are not catered for. Response: See response to (d) above.
  - f) Would it not be better to extend the play area next to the Bellway site? The proposal could see an increase in road traffic; is it good use of s106 money when there are already three play areas within 100m of each other; have other areas of Rolleston been considered for more worthwhile projects (cited the Tutbury s106 scheme); the proposal would significantly reduce "The Meadow View". Response: See responses to (a) and (b) above and (g) below. The council does not believe that the proposal would adversely impinge on the general view of the Open Space.

g) We propose that this is carried out closer to the Bellway development, on it itself or on a current playground not overlooked by residents. This will disrupt our peace and enjoyment of our property and also likely the saleability of the same. The proposed bright rainbow colours are not in keeping with the village. Response: The s106 Agreement states that the funds must be used within the vicinity of the Bellway development; the provision of three pieces of play equipment will not adversely affect residents or their properties; the colour scheme mirrors that of the existing play area.

**Resolved** That well over 1500 people had viewed the public consultation and, having considered the comments received, there were not enough negative responses to prevent the Parish Council proceeding with the scheme; that Playdale Playgrounds quotation in the sum of £44,465.42 be accepted subject to planning permission being given and that Playdale Playgrounds be requested to complete and submit the planning application on the council's behalf.

The above resolution was agreed unanimously.

The meeting closed at 9.15pm

Signed .....

Date .....