

**ROLLESTON ON DOVE PARISH COUNCIL**  
**CLERK'S REPORT DECEMBER 2016**

**PART 1**

**1. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

P/2016/01603 and P/2016/01614 – Listed building application for the erection of a single storey rear extension and replacement windows to front and side elevations. Wesley Cottage, School Lane

P/2016/016882 – Erection of a single storey rear extension, 27 Shotwood Close

P/2016/01722 – Erection of two storey side extension, erection of a single storey rear extension, erection of a front porch, installation of two front dormer windows, erection of a new chimney, installation of new doors and windows in all elevations and the erection of a detached building to form garage (amended scheme). 51 Beacon Road

P/2016/01696 – Erection of single storey rear extension, the installation of two new rooflights to the north elevation and the replacement of existing rooflights, Orchard Barn School Lane

P/2016/01729 - Installation of a rear dormer extension and installation of three rooflights to the front elevation to facilitate loft conversion, 51 The Lawns

**2. PLANNING DECISIONS**

The following applications have been permitted:

P/2016/01207 – Demolition of winter house and building of replacement dwelling, Hall Grounds.

P/2014/00818 - Secretary of State has refused outline permission for the 300+ homes and Primary School on the land off Craythorne Road.

P/2016/01461 - Crown reduction by 20% of one Sycamore tree (proposal revised by email on 8th November 2016) 5 Oak Trees Close (Apple Acres development)

P/2016/01394 – Part two storey part single storey rear and side extensions, 29 Beacon Road

P/2016/01505 – Felling of two Sycamore, 5 Brookside.

The following application has been refused:

P/2016/01469 – Outline application to develop the land by erection of a detached dwelling on rear garden of 2 Beacon Drive including detail of access and scale.

Owners of Hall Farm Church Road have requested that their property is included within the village boundary. As it is part of the old Rolleston Hall estate they consider this a reasonable request. Currently the house is within the boundary and the garden is outside. This was discussed with the Planners at ESBC on 5<sup>th</sup> December. The planners pointed out that this is frequently the case throughout the district for properties on the fringe of villages. The village boundary could potentially be amended which will require further discussion. Residents have been informed of position.

### **3. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING**

Meeting held with ESBC and NHP Steering Group and PC Representatives. In attendance were Cllr J Jessel, C O'Hare, N Perry, A Miller, S Khan, Cllr B Gooding, Cllr Sanderson, P Barnett , L Claber and J Bucknall.

ESBC outlined three options for the Neighbourhood Development Plan:

- a. Amend the plan, consult with residents and re-submit
- b. Receive a decision statement on the current plan, which would obviously say it does not conform to the Local Plan, then re-write the plan, consult with residents and re-submit
- Or
- c. receive the decision statement on the current plan and then abandon the plan altogether

The New Local Plan affords the village some protection from development, this is based on the village boundary. As ESBC currently have a five year land supply, any development outside the village boundary would be presumed to not be permitted, whilst anything inside the boundary could be. If the five year supply runs out then a developer could go for a site outside of the boundary. Discussion on windfall developments being 25 for the period of the local plan 2012 – 2031 was a figurative figure and following a decision by a planning Inspector of the Local Plan could not be considered to be a capped figure.

A Neighbourhood Plan holds some weight once it has been examined.

Front-runner Grant – there is still £7400 left in this grant (having spent £12,500 so far) for us to draw on. We were also advised on another source(s) of funding that may be available.

In terms of timescales it could take between 12-16 months from the draft plan stage to get signed off by ESBC. We would have to re-consult with villagers. The stages are outlined in the enclosed table.

The College Fields S106 is outlined in the outline planning application, and cannot now be amended.

## **PART 2**

### **4. ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT**

#### BACS

Jane Bucknall (Salary)	£473.87
---------------------------	---------

HMRC (Tax)	£118.40
---------------	---------

Jane Bucknall (Phone and Broadband)	£45.45
--	--------

Mr J Deacon (Environmental contract)	£769.17
---	---------

Mr P Gould (Mowing contract)	£1101.99
---------------------------------	----------

Mr P Gould (Mowing of Croft and Craythorne only)	£234
---	------

PEAC (Copier rental)	£270.74
-------------------------	---------

#### Income

None during this period.

### 5. **CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED**

The government is planning to bring in new rules forcing local councils to hold costly local referendums over increases to the parish precepts. The consultation paper from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) makes proposals to bring local councils in line with principal councils by requiring them to hold a referendum if they plan to increase their part of council tax above a certain amount, with the effect of introducing 'capping' for the first time. The limit for principal councils – which spend around £100 billion a year – is currently 2%, with an additional 2% recently introduced to allow them to generate new income for social care costs.

In many cases the costs of holding a local referendum to ask local people if they support an increase in parish spending will run well into thousands of pounds, often wiping out the proposed increase. Unlike principal councils, local councils do not receive grant funding from central government or a share of business rates and are primarily financed through the parish precept.

Email received from a resident who witnessed an incident of fly tipping at the former golf club on Craythorne Road. Passed to the Enforcement Team who along with the resident are going to try and obtain

evidence about the perpetrators who are allegedly returning to the site on a regular basis, before contacting the Landowner to remove the waste.

Notes received from Mr Hughes following the Flood Alleviation Meeting held with Resident on 11<sup>th</sup> November:

- 1) There is a ditch that runs from the rear of the Scout Centre, in a north west direction before it joins the Rolleston Brook in a non-return valve structure. See photo 402 above. Is this the structure that is of concern? Could the person who raised issue this get back to me please? I will be happy to raise the issue with the appropriate body.*
- 2) Somebody said that there is a large pipe down Chapel Lane that drops into the Rolleston Brook. I will check this with Severn Trent, but their sewer records only show a 9 inch pipe dropping in opposite Brookside.*
- 3) Check that SW from College Fields will go into SW sewers. This has recently been approved on appeal. I had been involved previously and asked that surface water from the site be discharges to adjacent Severn Trent sewers and not to the open ditches leading up to Meadow View. Our planning team will keep an eye out for the Reserved Matters application to ensure this is the case.*
- 4) Karen, I said I would come and look at the Meadowfields development with you. When would be a good time to do that?*
- 5) The residents of Brookside are understandably frustrated that we are bringing forward a scheme to protect properties threatened from surface water and they are not seeing any progress with the risk associated with the Rolleston Brook. I will raise this point with the Environment Agency.*
- 6) There was concern that the pipe down Beacon Road would be enlarged or improved and that would cause more water to come down to the bottom of the hill. I said we would be very careful not to let that happen.*
- 7) Residents on Meadow View wondered whether PLR might be available to houses behind the proposed bund. I will look into this, but our basic idea is that the bund will protect those properties.*
- 8) Some residents expressed concerns about the proposed road bunds to prevent the spread of floodwater. Two of these have since been omitted as they were not affording sufficient protection to justify their cost and the third one is similarly doubtful due to additional works needed to remove existing traffic calming humps. I will keep residents up to date on this.*

Email received from Owners/Developers of 14-16 Burnside:

- 1) trees over brook - we agree and have cut them back*
- 2) height of bridge - it will be blended, we have calculated tolerances and they are within the limits set by highways (NB the environment agency required the bridge to be as high as possible and therefore the tolerance is at its maximum - we would have preferred less)*

*3) we did originally have the site fencing set back but were ordered by health and safety to bring it forward, so it will need to stay where it is for the time being.*

They have also confirmed that the pipe across the Brook is their main electricity supply.

Email received from Mr Edwards:

*Some 4 or more years ago the Parish Council investigated ways of improving the acoustics in the Old Grammar School as it is very difficult for people in the public area to hear some councillors speak, it is obvious that nothing was done about this and the problem has not gone away. At the time the vicar had suggested going 50 - 50 with the PC on costs for a hearing aid loop and whilst this might be of benefit to those wearing hearing aids it would do nothing for those who do not.*

*I know of people who have stopped attending Parish Council meetings because they cannot hear so I would ask the PC to re-visit this subject so that public meetings can be heard by the public.*

Staffordshire County News Bulletin received outlining:

As part of the national Pothole Action Fund, Staffordshire County Council has been awarded almost £1.6 million to help towards repairing potholes in the county in 2017/18 – an increase of around £500,000 on this year. The Department for Transport has announced the “pothole fund” for Staffordshire in 2017/18 will be £1,582m compared to £1,069m in 2016/17. The core grant for maintenance will be £17,848m compared to £18,405m

ESBC have received a proposal by BT to remove the phone box at Beacon Drive/Beacon Road junction. 42 day consultation period began on 25<sup>th</sup> November. Posters have gone up in the phone box concerned and on Parish Council noticeboards.

Email received from Sylvia Martin:

*I would like to thank everyone who had a hand in the Festival this year. The church looked stunning with all the contributions and we had so many positive comments from our visitors.*

*I am pleased to tell you that we made around £2,800 which will go towards our new church lighting. We are hoping this will be in place early next year, so do come along and see what a difference it will make.*

*Thank you all again & best wishes for Christmas & the New Year,*

*Sylvia*