

1ST MARCH 1993

NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the New Forest District Council held at Appletree Court, Lyndhurst on Monday, 1st March 1993.

p Cllr. J.E. Coles - Chairman
p Cllr. Mrs. J.K. Vernon-Jackson, MBE, JP - Vice-Chairman

Councillors:

p Mrs. N.E. Alldridge
p K.E. Austin
p Mrs. O.A.M. Badland
p S. Bailey
p P.A. Baker
p Mrs. P.D. Baker
p Mrs. M.J. Bannister
p Major C. Beeton, MBE
p W.E.B. Boothby
p E.R. Bowring
p Mrs. D.M. Brooks
p D.S. Burdle
p R.J. Burnett
p Miss S.A. Cooke
p D.E. Cracknell
p J.G. Craig
p W.F. Croydon
p B.A. Cullers
p G. Dawson
p J.J. Dawson
p Miss P.A. Drake
p B.C. Earwicker
p Major S.S. Elvery
a Mrs. L.K. Errington
p L.P. Gibbs
p W.J. Greer
p A.J.C. Griffiths
p R.C.H. Hale

Councillors:

p F.R. Harrison
p Mrs. Y.P. Holloway
p Mrs. A.M. Howe
p J.M. Hoy
p J.A.G. Hutchins, JP
p J. Lovering
p J. Maynard
p N.D.M. McGeorge
p Mrs. M. McLean
p Miss G.E. Meaden
p R.F. Orton
p P.G. Pearce-Smith
p C.G. Ramsden
p A.W. Rice, TD
p Miss G.M. Rickus, CBE
p Mrs. M.J. Robinson
p D.N. Scott
p Lieut Col. M.J. Shand
p S.A. Shepherd
p A.J. Simmons
p Mrs. B. Smith
p Mrs. L.P. Snashall
a G. Spikins
p R.G. Vernon-Jackson
p S.S. Wade
p G.H. Wales
p Mrs. D. Wilson
p Mrs. P.A. Wyeth

Officers Attending:

P.A.D. Hyde, N.J. Gibbs, E.S. Johnson, D.A. Gurney, Mrs. M. Holmes,
I.B. Mackintosh, T.R. Simpson and Miss J. Debnam.

68. JAMES BULGER.

In calling for the customary silence at the start of the meeting, the Chairman asked members to remember James Bulger the murdered Liverpool toddler who was to

be buried that day.

69. MINUTES.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the special meeting held on 26th January 1993, having been circulated, be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

70. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

(a) Cllr. Mrs. Lesley Errington

The Chairman advised members that Cllr. Mrs. Errington had now returned home after her recent spell in hospital. As she needed to remain quiet Members were requested not to make personal calls. The Chairman reported that he had sent flowers on the Council's behalf.

(b) Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

The Chairman welcomed the proposals from the Boundary Commission that there should in future be two parliamentary constituencies wholly contained within the New Forest District boundary. The press release issued by the Commission referred particularly to this Council's argument that the constituencies should have greater adherence to local ties and district boundaries.

The Chairman looked forward to the Home Secretary formally approving the proposals.

71. LEISURE SERVICES COMMITTEE.

Cllr J.J. Dawson presented the minutes of the meeting held on 5th January 1993. He also thanked fellow Members, the officers and chairmen of the various consultative committees for their hard work and support during the last year. He advised members that the Leisure Services Committee were now bringing into force measures which would achieve substantial savings during the coming year and he hoped that these would be supported in the coming debate on the Council's budget.

On the motion that the minutes be received:-

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be received.

72. CENTRAL SERVICES COMMITTEE.

Cllr. Wade presented the minutes of the meeting held on 11th January 1993.

On the motion that the minutes be received and the

recommendations be adopted:-

- (a) Council Tax - Lump Sum and Non-Cash Discounts
(Minute 58)

Cllr. Rice noted that the wording of the resolution was a little obscure.

- (b) Council Tax Benefits, Local Scheme (Minute 59)

Cllr. Major Elvery, on behalf of members of the Royal British Legion and SAAFA welcomed the Council's decision to extend the same exemptions to the Council tax as had applied under the rates and Community Charge.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be received and the recommendations be adopted.

73. PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Cllr. G. Dawson presented the minutes of the meetings held on 13th January and 10th February 1993.

On the motion that the minutes be received and the recommendation be adopted:-

- (a) Minutes (Minute 173)

Cllr. Earwicker noted that the text in respect of paragraph c should refer to the countryside gaps between New Milton and Highcliffe.

- (b) Fordingbridge Town Scheme : Delegation of Authority to Offer Grant (Minute 175)

Cllr. Lt. Col. Shand questioned why he had not been consulted on the Town Scheme prior to the issue of a press release on the subject.

Cllr. G. Dawson reassured him that he, and the other Fordingbridge Councillors would be fully consulted as specific grant applications came forward for consideration.

- (c) Draft Explanatory Note on Planning and Affordable Housing (Minute 180)

Cllr. Craig expressed his opposition to any proposals to control the occupancy of affordable dwellings by conditions instead of through management by a body with a direct interest in the land.

- (d) Supermarket Proposals on A326 (Minute 185)

Cllr. Mrs. Robinson asked that it be noted that she had left the meeting after the consideration

of Minute 183 and had not been present for this item. If she had been present she would have disclosed an interest and left the meeting.

- (e) Planning Applications for Committee Decision (Minute 188)

Cllr. P.A. Baker could not recall having disclosed an interest in respect of application 50853.

- (f) Supermarket Proposals Along A326 (Minute 208)

Note: Cllrs. Shepherd and Miss Rickus disclosed an interest in respect of this matter and having left the meeting, took no part in the consideration or voting.

Cllr. G. Dawson drew Members' attention to the recommendation and advised them that the County Surveyor had now indicated, by letter, that reasons 2 and 3 given for the refusal of the duplicate application, number 51314, could not be sustained. The recommendation should therefore be amended by the deletion of the words "if as a result..... be advised that". He reminded members of the debate on applications for supermarket developments on three sites along the Waterside, which had included a special Planning Committee meeting and special meeting of the Council. The duplicate application number 51314, had been refused for four reasons. Reason 2 related to the capacity of roads in the vicinity and the provision of a roundabout on the Totton Western Bypass. The County Surveyor had confirmed that the junction of Michigan Way and the Totton Western Bypass would be inadequate, even without the construction of a supermarket. The applicant had agreed to contribute 500,000 towards the cost of a grade separated junction, to be constructed during the present contract for the construction of Stage 3 of the bypass. The applicants had also agreed to provide traffic lights at the junction of Michigan Way and Calmore Road. These highway improvements represented an environmental gain to the area. Reason 3 related to increased rat-running of traffic through residential areas. The County Surveyor did not consider that there would be significant rat-running through residential areas as traffic would, with the proposed highway improvements, find it more convenient to use the major distributor routes. Reason 4 related to shopping impact should three supermarkets be permitted on the Waterside. Cllr. G. Dawson was sad to report that all the shopping experts agreed that there would be no sustainable objection with respect to the impact of two supermarkets on other shops. In conclusion, he considered that the reasons for refusal would be difficult to defend on appeal, and in addition

refusal of application 51315 would make the Council more vulnerable to the appeal in respect of Newmans Copse, Hounslow where there were serious concerns about highway issues and industrial land supply. He believed that any choice lay between the two applications for supermarket development near Totton. Refusal of both was not a realistic option. He preferred the choice to be made by this Council, rather than the Secretary of State on appeal.

Cllr. Burdle questioned that this application had been brought forward for determination after the refusal of the duplicate at the special meeting of the Council. He did not agree that the reasons for refusal were not sustainable at appeal. He recalled that the development plan for Totton had envisaged the concentration of shopping on a revitalised town centre, with out of town shopping specifically excluded. The town centre and local shops had shown increased signs of vitality over the last 12-18 months. He also referred to the effect that out of town developments were having on the shopping centres of Winchester and Salisbury. He quoted estimates that traffic through the Ringwood Road/Calmore Road junction would increase by 25%, while use of the Calmore Road/Michigan Way junction would increase by 40%. He considered that much of the traffic would use Crabbs Way. He did not agree that this was a distributor road, but had been built for housing and was not yet even complete. He refuted the suggestion that rat-running would not be significant and referred to a recent case where a 7% increase in rat-running had been supported on appeal as a reason for refusal.

Cllr. Burdle moved as an amendment that application 51315 be refused. The amendment was seconded by Cllr. J.J. Dawson.

Cllr. Harrison supported Cllr. Burdle's concerns about the effect of the proposals on the town centre, but did not believe that the Council had the choice to refuse both applications for supermarkets near Totton, merely to decide which of the proposals it preferred. He noted the projected inadequacy of the present junction between Michigan Way and the bypass, and the planning gain which would result from the agreed improvements. He also noted that Crabbs Way and Michigan Way were distributor routes, although housing would back onto these roads. As much of the development was still to be constructed there remained the opportunity to amend development proposals to mitigate the effects of this supermarket. Cllr. Harrison asked that this matter be determined by a recorded vote, and in accordance with Standing Order 19 more than 15 other Members stood in their places to signify their support.

Cllr. Mrs. Bannister considered that, in addition to providing welcome competition to improve customer service in the Totton shops, the traffic lights on Calmore Road would have a beneficial traffic calming effect.

Cllrs. Mrs. Alldridge, Cullers, Lovering and Pearce-Smith spoke of the lack of choice to refuse this application. National shopping trends were towards out-of-town centres and refusal of this application would increase the Council's vulnerability to the appeal at Newmans Copse. There would be serious consequences relating to appeal costs, and also the loss of industrial, job creating, land if this application was refused.

Cllr. Boothby considered that any additional traffic using Calmore Road would cause undesirable congestion, with the proposed traffic lights causing traffic jams.

Cllr. Rice supported the concern expressed by Cllr. Burdle that this application had been brought forward for determination after the refusal of the duplicate. In view of the major financial implications of the decision, and the receipt of late advice from the County Surveyor, he suggested that the application should be deferred.

Cllr. J.J. Dawson expressed his total opposition to any out-of-town development near Totton. He considered the existing supermarkets in Totton had good accessibility and had successfully competed against other stores in the town. The application for Dibden Bottom Farm had been approved and the Council should not therefore be forced into approving this proposal. He believed that local people did not want the supermarket and he regretted that the Strategic Growth in Totton Advisory Committee had not been given the opportunity to comment. He suggested that this was an opportunist application which would not have come forward if there had not been a slump in the housing market.

Cllr. Burdle reminded Members that the application should be determined on planning issues alone, which included the question of policy. He also regretted that the Strategic Growth in Totton Advisory Committee had not been asked to comment, and spoke of local opposition to the application. The policies which applied were unchanged, even in the developing District Wide Local Plan, and reserved this land for housing while opposing out-of-town shopping developments. If the policies were now out-of-date they should be reviewed urgently.

The Council appeared to have been forced into a choice between the loss of housing land and the loss of industrial land. He also noted that the provision of a grade separated junction involved dualling the road for one half kilometre either side. This was not in the present road programme.

Cllr. G. Dawson welcomed the full debate on this matter. In reply to the points raised he suggested that the applicants would be able to demonstrate massive support for the proposed supermarket. He concurred with Members' concerns about the future of Totton town centre but believed the Council must be realistic in the light of the advice from consultants. Other policy avenues would have to be pursued to safeguard town centre shopping, which was already under threat. He noted that there would be planning gain from the proposed road improvements. He believed that development of this site had been the subject of prolonged debate and it was now essential to both the applicants and local people that a conclusion was reached at this meeting. Finally, while accepting that the application was opportunistic in the light of the depressed housing market, he suggested that had this application not come forward, proposals would have been put forward for a site further to the north, along the A36. He reiterated his view that there was no defensible case for refusal.

The vote on the amendment that application 51315 be refused was recorded as following:-

For	Against	Abstained
K E Austin	Mrs N E Alldridge	E R Bowring
Major C Beeton	Mrs O A M Badland	Miss P A Drake
W E B Boothby	S Bailey	Major S S Elvery
D S Burdle	P A Baker	J A G Hutchins
J J Dawson	Mrs P D Baker	Miss G E Meaden
B C Earwicker	Mrs M J Bannister	R F Orton
J M Hoy	Mrs D M Brooks	A W Rice
Mrs M McLean	R J Burnett	G H Wales
C G Ramsden	Miss S A Cooke	Mrs P A Wyeth
A J Simmons	D E Cracknell	
Mrs L P Snashall	J G Craig	
	W F Croydon	
	B A Cullers	
	G Dawson	
	L P Gibbs	
	W J Greer	
	A J C Griffiths	
	R C H Hale	
	F R Harrison	
	Mrs Y P Holloway	
	Mrs A M Howe	
	J Lovering	

J Maynard
N D M McGeorge
P G Pearce-Smith
Mrs M J Robinson

D N Scott
Lt Col M J Shand
Mrs B Smith
Mrs J K Vernon-Jackson
R G Vernon-Jackson
S S Wade
Mrs D Wilson

With 11 Members voting in favour, 33 voting against and 9 abstentions, the amendment was lost.

- (g) Former Marchwood Power Station, Magazine Lane, Marchwood (Minute 209)

Cllr. Rice expressed his disappointment at the decision to refuse this application. He believed that the Council should be encouraging job creation and suggested that the local roads were adequate for the additional traffic which would have been generated.

Cllr. Mrs. Alldridge disagreed strongly and pointed out that only nine or ten jobs would have been created, at the cost of 100 return lorry movements per day. Bury Road at Marchwood took the traffic to the military port and was already inadequate for that purpose. The number of jobs generated was not enough to justify the environmental disruption. This view was supported by Cllr. Burnett.

Cllr. Mrs. Bannister questioned what proportion of traffic to the military port was carried by rail but was advised that the majority was taken in by road, and in addition all traffic to the proposed site would have been taken by road.

Cllr. G. Dawson considered the decision to refuse had been correct. The proposal represented a net loss of jobs compared with what could be generated by other uses on the site, and there was the additional adverse impact on local people that would be caused by the lorry movement.

- (h) Sunnyside Cottage, Woodgreen Road, Fordingbridge - Two-storey Rear Addition (Demolish Existing Extension) (Application 51052) (Minute 215)

Cllr. Lovering thanked his fellow members on the Planning Committee and the officers for the sympathetic attitude that they had taken to this application. He believed that the small dwellings policy did not, at the lower end of the size scale, allow sufficient discretion to meet

the aspirations of a modern family. He welcomed the constructive attitude which had been taken.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be received and the recommendation to minute 208, as amended by the deletion of the words 'if as a result ... be advised that ', be adopted.

74. ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMITTEE.

Cllr. Hoy presented the minutes of the meeting held on 14th January 1993.

On the motion that the minutes be received and the recommendation be adopted:-

(a) Fluoridation of Water Supplies (Minute 112)

Cllr. Mrs. Robinson recalled that the Committee had experienced great difficulty in reaching a decision. She felt that this was an important issue, which should have been the subject of a recommendation to the Council for determination. She moved that this minute be referred back for further consideration. The amendment was seconded by Cllr. Miss Cooke.

Cllr. Hoy indicated that he was willing to accept the minute back for further consideration.

Cllr. Cullers disagreed with the principle of the minute being referred back as the decision had already been taken. He requested that the principle of reference back be determined by a recorded vote, but in accordance with Standing Order No. 19, insufficient Members stood in support. Cllr. Burdle also questioned the procedure being adopted, particularly with respect to the proposed change to Standing Orders which would be considered under the minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee, which would allow full debate of the notice of motion on this subject later in the meeting.

(b) Development of Health For All In The New Forest (Minute 113)

Cllr. Cullers believed it was wrong in principle for this Council to carry out a function which was the duty of the Health Authority, particularly in the light of the previous decision not to fund traffic lights in New Milton. Cllr. Griffiths agreed and moved that the matter be referred back for further consideration. The amendment was seconded by Cllr. Cullers.

Cllr. Craig considered that, with unitary

authority status pending, the Council should take an active role in any subject which affected the population of the District. Cllr. Miss Rickus cautioned, however, that appearing to take too wide a role might be counter-productive in the eyes of the Local Government Commission.

Cllr. Mrs. Robinson was concerned at the implication that Health for All should not be seen as the responsibility of this Council. It was government policy that all bodies should play a part. She also pointed out that item (g) of the resolution recognised that primary responsibility lay with the Health Authority who should be urged to make adequate budgetary provision. This view was supported by Cllr. Lt. Col. Shand who reminded Members that the funding was for work which would be carried out by the Council's own officers, in the field of health promotion. He also believed that had there been greater attention to this aspect, the forthcoming debate on fluoridation of water supplies would have been better informed.

Cllr. Hoy reminded Members that the Council's policies and corporate image included the promotion of Health For All.

With 5 Members voting in favour and the majority voting against, the amendment was lost.

- (c) Concessionary Travel Scheme - Discount on Tokens Purchased (Minute 114)

Cllr. Burdle asked for confirmation that the Council was being penalised through achieving a higher than expected redemption rate.

Cllr. Hoy confirmed that the redemption rate was higher than anticipated and the Council had indeed lost some of the discount originally offered.

- (d) Tobacco Advertising (Minute 118)

Cllr. Croydon welcomed the decision to make further representations to Government on this matter and deplored the decision announced the previous week that the Government would be stopping payments to general practitioners to help people to stop smoking. He would be bringing this matter up at a future meeting of the Committee.

- (e) Creation of Public Footpath Between Brownsea Close and Gore Road Industrial Estate, New Milton (Minute 126)

Cllr. Earwicker welcomed the support being given to the creation of a public footpath but was

concerned that the bridge over the railway line, which was heavily used by the public, might be lost following pressure from other quarters.

Cllr. Rice advised Members that he had been involved in the protection of this footpath for over 10 years and negotiations to secure the protection of the bridge were progressing well.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be received and the recommendation be adopted, subject to the reference back of minute 112 for further consideration.

75. EMERGENCIES COMMITTEE.

Cllr. Lt. Col. Shand presented the minutes of the meeting held on 18th January 1993.

On the motion that the minutes be received:-

- (a) Elected Member Observers At Emergency Team Meetings (Minute 24)

At the suggestion of Cllr. Major Beeton it was agreed that the words 'both working part-time' would be added at the end of the last sentence of the third paragraph.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be received, subject to the amendment of paragraph 3 of minute 24 by the addition of the words 'both working part-time' to the end of the last sentence.

76. HOUSING COMMITTEE.

Cllr. Mrs. Bannister presented the minutes of the meetings held on 19th January and 16th February 1993.

On the motion that the minutes be received and the recommendations be adopted:-

- (a) Rural Housing Scheme - Boldre (Minute 108)

Cllr. Griffiths was pleased that the Housing Committee had supported this application for social housing in Boldre, particularly with respect to the shared equity element. He considered that there was a great demand for this type of accommodation and the application had received local support. He was sad that there had ultimately been a conflict with the views of the Planning Committee who had refused the application. He considered the Council should be trying to house people within their villages.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be received and the recommendations be adopted.

77. LICENSING COMMITTEE.

Cllr. Burnett presented the minutes of the meeting held on 21st January 1993.

On the motion that the minutes be received and the recommendations be adopted:-

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be received and the recommendations be adopted.

78. POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE.

Cllr. Maynard presented the minutes of the meeting held on 3rd February 1993.

On the motion that the minutes be received and the recommendations be adopted:-

(a) General Fund Revenue Budget (Minute 99)

Cllr. Maynard advised Members that the Policy and Resources Committee had adopted Budget Option A, for a net revenue budget of 13.536m and this decision had subsequently been supported by the National Non-Domestic Ratepayers Consultative Committee. In 1993/94 the Council faced increases in expenditure over which it had no control, and in addition earnings from investments were expected to fall by 400,000. The budget did, however, include provision for some real growth in services. Cllr. Maynard listed projects to be funded from the additional, discretionary, element of 450,000. The overall increase in budget had been contained to 998,000 through careful housekeeping relating to the cost of administration and overheads.

It was moved by Cllr. Rice and seconded by Cllr. Cullers that Standing Order 14(4) be suspended to remove the time limit on speeches for the debate on this item. The motion was agreed.

Cllr. Burdle presented an alternative budget which had been produced by the Conservative Group of Councillors, which he put forward in a spirit of co-operation, in the interest of local people. He considered the alternative budget, which represented a reduction of 625,000 against the Policy and Resources Committee budget, would not involve job cuts, but represented a prudent budget in a time of recession. The suggested

budget was derived from options B and C which had been considered the Policy and Resources Committee. The savings from the Central Services, Environmental Services, Leisure Services and Planning Committees would be 30,000, 74,000, 122,000 and 54,000 respectively. Of this amount the Environmental Services, Leisure Services and Planning Committees would have to find savings of 50,000, 60,000 and 50,000 respectively which had not yet been identified. In addition capital financing of 150,000 would be deleted, and an additional 195,000 would be taken from reserves. The budget represented an increase over 1992/93 of 2.97% and established a council tax of 59.00 for a band D property. If adopted this would be the lowest council tax in the county.

Cllr. Burdle moved as an amendment that the revised budget be adopted. The amendment was seconded by Cllr. Craig.

Cllr. Baker was surprised that alternatives had not been put forward during the period from April 1992 during which the budget had been prepared and debated. He considered the revised budget was imprudent and irresponsible, leading to a shortfall of funding from reserves in coming years, and relying on Committees to achieve cuts which had not been specified. He considered the inevitable delay in setting the Council's budget which this would cause would be costly and delay the service of council tax bills. This disruption and the additional costs entailed were designed to achieve savings which amounted to only 19p per household per week.

Cllrs. Pearce-Smith, R.G. Vernon-Jackson, Cullers, Mrs. Smith, J.J. Dawson, Mrs. Robinson, Earwicker, Mrs. Baker and Mrs. Alldridge questioned the late submission of the alternative budget and expressed their concern at the proposed deletion of items of revenue expenditure; and particularly the inclusion of unspecified cuts when the Committees had experienced such difficulties in confining their budgets. Service increases were to meet public and local Council demands.

Cllrs. Griffiths and Mrs. Wilson considered the budget put forward by the Policy and Resources Committee was profligate, representing an increase in expenditure of 26% over the last two years. It had not been possible to produce the alternative budget until the Policy and Resources Committee had reached its conclusions. They considered a Council Tax of 68.80 represented a substantial increase in real terms and believed that as much money as possible should be left

with local people, to spend as they chose. They did not believe the revised budget would necessitate staff cuts as it merely cut back on proposed increases in services.

Cllr. Lovering disputed claims that 1m of savings had been found. He believed that the actual exercise had involved the examination of desirable activities to direct funds from them towards essential services. The alternative budget sought to increase this trend, leaving local people with a greater discretion in the way in which they spent their money.

Cllr. Mrs. Bannister cautioned that it would be wise to leave some scope within the budget in case Government changed the rules with respect to capping. It would be easier to cut discretionary items than be left with only the option of cutting essential services.

Cllr. Croydon reminded Members that there was a need to replenish reserves which had been used in previous years to supplement the budget. The option of using reserves was no longer available.

Cllr. Greer spoke of the need to achieve savings during a world-wide recession. He recalled that income from investments had been higher in 1992/93 than had been predicted in the approved budget and believed this money should now be returned to local people, rather than being used to boost reserves. He cited the increase in local taxation that would be suffered by residents in Brockenhurst, even with transitional relief, and did not believe the proposed increase in budget could be justified. This view was supported by Cllr. Rice who recalled that other Councils were being forced to make significant cuts in their budgets. He felt there was scope for savings in this authority and cited the District Auditor's letter on development control costs as an example. He also suggested that if expenditure by Town and Parish Councils was added to the budget, this authority would exceed the SSA by 1.38m. Cllr. Scott also concurred and suggested the Council lacked vision and direction. He considered money should be directed more towards essential items such as housing. He regretted that the budget was not being contained and did not believe the Council could justify proposed expenditure which was in excess of the family average.

Cllr. G. Dawson deplored the tone of the debate. He recalled that prior to 1991 the reserves had been run down in support of the budget and considered it unrealistic to claim the relative position which now resulted was a massive overspend. The Council should safeguard its

future. He considered it irresponsible to base the revised budget on unidentified cuts. With respect to the planning service, there had been continual improvement through the work of the Planning Committee and Planning Committee Advisory Working Party and the search for excellence would continue in the long-term. He paid tribute to the work carried out also under the auspices of the previous Chairman of the Committee, Cllr. Miss Drake.

Cllr. Harrison remarked that the increases in local taxation which people in the smaller houses in Totton would pay arose solely because of the characteristics of the council tax, and transitional relief would not apply to these smaller, poorer households.

Cllr. Craig reiterated the view that it was not possible to prepare an alternative budget until the Policy and Resources Committee had made their decisions. The alternative was based on the options put forward to the Policy and Resources Committee, and there was therefore no new information for members to have to consider. The options to Policy and Resources Committee had included unidentified cuts to some Committee budgets. He considered the Council lacked direction and was consequently allowing itself to spend more money than could be justified, particularly in the light of an increase above inflation in the previous year. Increased income from investments during the last year had confirmed that the 1992/93 budget was higher than necessary; as had the underspend on a number of budget heads. The revised budget could be achieved without savings even of that order. Money left in the local economy would generate jobs and if necessary the reserves should be depleted further to achieve that aim.

Cllr. Burdle regretted that the revised budget had not been received in the spirit in which it had been presented. He agreed with Cllr. Craig's views about the late distribution of the alternative budget and, based on slack in the 1992/93 budget, the ease with which savings could be achieved. The budget should be strictly contained, to meet the needs of local people. He thanked the officers for their help in preparing the alternative budget.

Cllr. Maynard regretted that the alternative budget had not been put forward at an earlier stage, and members had not engaged in more rigorous debate at the Policy and Resources Committee when the budget had been decided. He believed that the County Council's decision not to fund their responsibilities fully was causing an increase in this Council's budget to maintain

services. It was not a practical option to take further funds from reserves. He also regretted that the stance being adopted by some Councillors was at odds with that they had adopted with respect to the savings under the management restructuring.

With 20 Members voting in favour, 34 voting against and one abstention, the amendment was lost.

(b) St Barbe's, Lyminster (Minute 101)

Cllr. Scott considered it unusual to purchase any property prior to the completion of a structural survey. Cllrs. Griffiths and Greer expressed their concern that the Council was consequently entering into an unknown commitment.

Cllr. R.G. Vernon-Jackson recalled that the site value was greater than the purchase price and welcomed the prompt action taken to secure the building for community purposes.

Cllr. Maynard confirmed that the value of the site was significant. The building had been inspected prior to purchase but it was considered prudent to carry out a full survey following completion.

(c) Externally Invested Funds - Unused Capital Receipts (Minute 104)

Cllr. Rice considered it would have been better to repay loan commitments than to embark on fresh investments.

Cllrs. R.G. Vernon-Jackson and G. Dawson considered it was necessary to take a long-term view with respect to the use of the capital receipts, and there was always the hope that the funds might be released at some future date to pay for low-cost housing for the homeless.

(d) Applications for Grants (Minute 105)

Cllr. Major Elvery welcomed the proposed grant to be given to the Royal Hampshire Regiment Museum.

(e) Royal Corps of Transport, Marchwood (Minute 113)

Cllr. Lt. Col. Shand reminded Members that it was likely that the Royal Corps of Transport would have been disbanded before formal affiliation was confirmed. He suggested the recommendation should be amended by the addition of the words 'or their successors' to the end.

Cllr. McGeorge expressed his opposition in principle to any affiliation between the Council

and a military organisation.

The amendment was agreed.

(f) Staff Consultative Committee (Minute 114)

Cllr. Craig expressed his concern that members had caused offence to officers by smoking in the building, when it was a disciplinary offence for the officers to do so. He hoped that all Members would take this matter seriously and action would be taken against any member who did not comply.

Cllr. Burnett spoke of difficulties he had had with officers seeking to prevent members from smoking in the grounds.

Cllr. Mrs. Smith asked members to remember to wear their name badges, now this was a requirement of staff.

Cllr. Coles considered advice was needed on the action that could be taken against Members smoking in the building.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be received and the recommendations be adopted subject to the amendment of Minute 113 by the addition of the words 'or their successors' to the decision.

79. ADJOURNMENT AND RESUMPTION OF MEETING.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 1.00 p.m. and resumed at 1.45 p.m. with the following Members present:-

Cllr. J.E. Coles - Chairman

Cllr. Mrs. J.K. Vernon-Jackson, MBE, JP - Vice-Chairman

Councillors:

Mrs. N.E. Alldridge
K.E. Austin
Mrs. O.A.M. Badland
S. Bailey
P.A. Baker
Mrs. P.D. Baker
Mrs. M.J. Bannister
Major C. Beeton, MBE
W.E.B. Boothby
E.R. Bowring
Mrs. D.M. Brooks
D.S. Burdle
R.J. Burnett
Miss S.A. Cooke
D.E. Cracknell
J.G. Craig

Councillors:

F.R. Harrison
Mrs. Y.P. Holloway
Mrs. A.M. Howe
J.M. Hoy
J.A.G. Hutchins, JP
J. Lovering
J. Maynard
N.D.M. McGeorge
Mrs. M. McLean
Miss G.E. Meaden
R.F. Orton
P.G. Pearce-Smith
C.G. Ramsden
A.W. Rice, TD
Miss G.M. Rickus, CBE
Mrs. M.J. Robinson

W.F. Croydon	D.N. Scott
B.A. Cullers	Col. M.J. Shand
G. Dawson	S.A. Shepherd
J.J. Dawson	A.J. Simmons
Miss P.A. Drake	Mrs. B. Smith
B.C. Earwicker	Mrs. L.P. Snashall
Major S.S. Elvery	R.G. Vernon-Jackson
L.P. Gibbs	S.S. Wade
W.J. Greer	Mrs. D. Wilson
A.J.C. Griffiths	Mrs. P.A. Wyeth
R.C.H. Hale	

80. 1993/94 COUNCIL TAX (REPORT A).

Members discussed the Council Tax proposed in a number of parishes and remarked on differences in precept. It appeared that the larger parishes attracted a higher council tax charge, and this directly related to their size.

Members also discussed the present rules regarding the expenditure which had to be included in the calculation of this Council's standard spending assessment. At present Town and Parish Councils' expenditure was excluded. It was recognised that the degree to which local councils carried out functions themselves varied, with many smaller rural parishes relying heavily on this Council to undertake services in their area.

RESOLVED:

(a) That it be noted that at its meeting on 4 January 1993 the Council calculated the following amounts for the year 1993/94 in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-

(1) 63,747.50 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its council tax base for the year.

(2) LOCAL COUNCIL AREA

ASHURST AND COLBURY	840.13
BEAULIEU	480.75
BOLDRE	1,012.23
BRAMSHAW	310.89
BRANSGORE	1,732.77
BREAMORE	173.67
BROCKENHURST	1,599.71
BURLEY	730.56
COPYTHORNE	1,108.01

DAMERHAM	226.42
DENNY LODGE	162.50
EAST BOLDRE	374.66
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE AND IBSLEY	546.04
EXBURY AND LEPE	110.19
FAWLEY	4,246.91
FORDINGBRIDGE	2,189.61
HALE	235.94
HORDLE	2,064.69
HYDE	458.86
HYPHE AND DIBDEN	6,649.65
LYMINGTON AND PENNINGTON	6,331.20
LYNDHURST	1,370.63
MARCHWOOD	1,574.03
MARTIN	178.54
MILFORD ON SEA	2,631.10
MINSTEAD	334.40
NETLEY MARSH	750.37
NEW MILTON	9,402.29
RINGWOOD	4,765.49
ROCKBOURNE	157.88
SANDLEHEATH	231.64
SOPLEY	289.30
SWAY	1,517.45
TOTTON AND ELING	8,623.89
WHITSBURY	95.16
WOODGREEN	239.94

63,747.50

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its council tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

(b) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 1993/94 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992:-

(1) 57,124,174 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act.

(2) 41,912,710 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act.

(3) 15,211,464 being the amount by which the aggregate at (b)(1) above exceeds the aggregate at (b)(2) above,

calculated by the Council,
in accordance with Section
32(4) of the Act, as its
budget requirement for the
year.

(4) 9,149,684 being the aggregate of the
sums which the Council
estimates will be payable
for the year into its
general fund in respect of
redistributed non-domestic
rates and revenue support
grant.

(5) 95.09 being the amount at (b)(3)
above less the amount at
(b)(4) above, all divided
by the amount at (b)(1)
above, calculated by the
Council, in accordance
with Section 33(1) of the
Act, as the basic amount
of its council tax for the
year.

(6) 1,675,444 being the aggregate amount
of all special items
referred to in Section
34(1) of the Act.

(7) 68.81 being the amount at (b)(5)
above less the result
given by dividing the
amount at (b)(6) above by
the amount at (b)(1)
above, calculated by the
Council, in accordance
with Section 34(2) of the
Act, as the basic amount
of its council tax for the
year for dwellings in
those parts of its area to
which no special item
relates.

(8) LOCAL COUNCIL AREA

ASHURST AND COLBURY	85.47
BEAULIEU	75.47
BOLDRE	74.74
BRAMSHAW	73.63
BRANSGORE	74.44
BREAMORE	75.72
BROCKENHURST	77.41
BURLEY	72.92
COPYTHORNE	73.21
DAMERHAM	74.99
DENNY LODGE	73.12
EAST BOLDRE	74.15
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE AND IBSLEY	74.30

EXBURY AND LEPE	71.53
FAWLEY	124.30
FORDINGBRIDGE	107.50
HALE	79.41
HORDLE	84.26
HYDE	74.26
HYPHE AND DIBDEN	101.80
LYMINGTON AND PENNINGTON	97.40
LYNDHURST	74.65
MARCHWOOD	112.71
MARTIN	81.13
MILFORD ON SEA	81.54
MINSTEAD	74.79
NETLEY MARSH	70.33
NEW MILTON	98.23
RINGWOOD	90.80
ROCKBOURNE	71.98
SANDLEHEATH	75.29
SOPLEY	82.46
SWAY	74.74
TOTTON AND ELING	108.13
WHITSBURY	70.91
WOODGREEN	75.06

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at b(7) above the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at b(2) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

(9) PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA

	VALUATION BAND							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
LOCAL COUNCIL AREA								
ASHURST & COLBURY	56.98	66.48	75.97	85.47	104.46	123.46	142.45	170.94
BEAULIEU	50.31	58.70	67.08	75.47	92.24	109.01	125.78	150.94
BOLDRE	49.83	58.13	66.44	74.74	91.35	107.96	124.57	149.48
BRAMSHAW	49.09	57.27	65.45	73.63	89.99	106.35	122.72	147.26
BRANGSORE	49.63	57.90	66.17	74.44	90.98	107.52	124.07	148.88
BREAMORE	50.48	58.89	67.31	75.72	92.55	109.37	126.20	151.44
BROCKENHURST	51.61	60.21	68.81	77.41	94.61	111.81	129.02	154.82
BURLEY	48.61	56.72	64.82	72.92	89.12	105.33	121.53	145.84
COPYTHORNE	48.81	56.94	65.08	73.21	89.48	105.75	122.02	146.42
DAMERHAM	49.99	58.33	66.66	74.99	91.65	108.32	124.98	149.98
DENNY LODGE	48.75	56.87	65.00	73.12	89.37	105.62	121.87	146.24

EAST BOLDRE	49.43	57.67	65.91	74.15	90.63	107.11	123.58	148.30
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	49.53	57.79	66.04	74.30	90.81	107.32	123.83	148.60
EXBURY & LEPE	47.69	55.63	63.58	71.53	87.43	103.32	119.22	143.06
FAWLEY	82.87	96.68	110.49	124.30	151.92	179.54	207.17	248.60
FORDINGBRIDGE	71.67	83.61	95.56	107.50	131.39	155.28	179.17	215.00
HALE	52.94	61.76	70.59	79.41	97.06	114.70	132.35	158.82
HORDLE	56.17	65.54	74.90	84.26	102.98	121.71	140.43	168.52
HYDE	49.51	57.76	66.01	74.26	90.76	107.26	123.77	148.52
HYTHER & DIBDEN	67.87	79.18	90.49	101.80	124.42	147.04	169.67	203.60
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	64.93	75.76	86.58	97.40	119.04	140.69	162.33	194.80
LYNDHURST	49.77	58.06	66.36	74.65	91.24	107.83	124.42	149.30
MARCHWOOD	75.14	87.66	100.19	112.71	137.76	162.80	187.85	225.42
MARTIN	54.09	63.10	72.12	81.13	99.16	117.19	135.22	162.26
MILFORD-ON-SEA	54.36	63.42	72.48	81.54	99.66	117.78	135.90	163.08
MINSTEAD	49.86	58.17	66.48	74.79	91.41	108.03	124.65	149.58
NETLEY MARSH	46.89	54.70	62.52	70.33	85.96	101.59	117.22	140.66
NEW MILTON	65.49	76.40	87.32	98.23	120.06	141.89	163.72	196.46
RINGWOOD	60.53	70.62	80.71	90.80	110.98	131.16	151.33	181.60
ROCKBOURNE	47.99	55.98	63.98	71.98	87.98	103.97	119.97	143.96
SANDLEHEATH	50.19	58.56	66.92	75.29	92.02	108.75	125.48	150.58
SOPLEY	54.97	64.14	73.30	82.46	100.78	119.11	137.43	164.92
SWAY	49.83	58.13	66.44	74.74	91.35	107.96	124.57	149.48
TOTTON & ELING	72.09	84.10	96.12	108.13	132.16	156.19	180.22	216.26
WHITSBURY	47.27	55.15	63.03	70.91	86.67	102.43	118.18	141.82
WOODGREEN	50.04	58.38	66.72	75.06	91.74	108.42	125.10	150.12

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (b)(7) and (b)(8) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

- (c) That it be noted that for the year 1993/94 the Hampshire County Council has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

PRECEPTING AUTHORITY

VALUATION BAND

A B C D E F G H

PERCEPTING AUTHORITY
HAMPSHIRE COUNTY

COUNCIL 246.24 287.28 328.32 369.36 451.44 533.52 615.60 738.72

(d) That having circulated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at b(9) and (c) above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of council tax for the year 1993/94 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA

VALUATION BAND

A B C D E F G H

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA

ASHURST & COLBURY	303.22	353.76	404.29	454.83	555.90	656.98	758.05	909.66
BEAULIEU	296.55	345.98	395.40	444.83	543.68	642.53	741.38	889.66
BOLDRE	296.07	345.41	394.76	444.10	542.79	641.48	740.17	888.20
BRAMSHAW	295.33	344.55	393.77	442.99	541.43	639.87	738.32	885.98
BRANGSORE	295.87	345.18	394.49	443.80	542.42	641.04	739.67	887.60
BREAMORE	296.72	346.17	395.63	445.08	543.99	642.89	741.80	890.16
BROCKENHURST	297.85	347.49	397.13	446.77	546.05	645.33	744.62	893.54
BURLEY	294.85	344.00	393.14	442.28	540.56	638.85	737.13	884.56
COPYTHORNE	295.05	344.22	393.40	442.57	540.92	639.27	737.62	885.14
DAMERHAM	296.23	345.61	394.98	444.35	543.09	641.84	740.58	888.70
DENNY LODGE	294.99	344.15	393.32	442.48	540.81	639.14	737.47	884.96
EAST BOLDRE	295.67	344.95	394.23	443.51	542.07	640.63	739.18	887.02
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	295.77	345.07	394.36	443.66	542.25	640.84	739.43	887.32
EXBURY & LEPE	293.93	342.91	391.90	440.89	538.87	636.84	734.82	881.78
FAWLEY	329.11	383.96	438.81	493.66	603.36	713.06	822.77	987.32
FORDINGBRIDGE	317.91	370.89	423.88	476.86	582.83	688.80	794.77	953.72
HALE	299.18	349.04	398.91	448.77	548.50	648.22	747.95	897.54
HORDLE	302.41	352.82	403.22	453.62	554.42	655.23	756.03	907.24
HYDE	295.75	345.04	394.33	443.62	542.20	640.78	739.37	887.24
HYTHE & DIBDEN	314.11	366.46	418.81	471.16	575.86	680.56	785.27	942.32
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	311.17	363.04	414.90	466.76	570.48	674.21	777.93	933.52
LYNDHURST	296.01	345.34	394.68	444.01	542.68	641.35	740.02	888.02
MARCHWOOD	321.38	374.94	428.51	482.07	589.20	696.32	803.45	964.14
MARTIN	300.33	350.38	400.44	450.49	550.60	650.71	750.82	900.98
MILFORD-ON-SEA	300.60	350.70	400.80	450.90	551.10	651.30	751.50	901.80
MINSTEAD	296.10	345.45	394.80	444.15	542.85	641.55	740.25	888.30
NETLEY MARSH	293.13	341.98	390.84	439.69	537.40	635.11	732.82	879.38
NEW MILTON	311.73	363.68	415.64	467.59	571.50	675.41	779.32	935.18
RINGWOOD	306.77	357.90	409.03	460.16	562.42	664.68	766.93	920.32
ROCKBOURNE	294.23	343.26	392.30	441.34	539.42	637.49	735.57	882.68
SANDLEHEATH	296.43	345.84	395.24	444.65	543.46	642.27	741.08	889.30
SOPLEY	301.21	351.42	401.62	451.82	552.22	652.63	753.03	903.64
SWAY	296.07	345.41	394.76	444.10	542.79	641.48	740.17	888.20
TOTTON & ELING	318.33	371.38	424.44	477.49	583.60	689.71	795.82	954.98
WHITSBURY	293.51	342.43	391.35	440.27	538.11	635.95	733.78	880.54
WOODGREEN	296.28	345.66	395.04	444.42	543.18	641.94	740.70	888.84

81. PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCY BOUNDARIES (REPORT B).

Members considered a report on the findings of the Boundary Commission.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That it be noted that the Commission have accepted the Council's proposals for the establishment for two parliamentary constituencies wholly contained within the boundaries of the District; and
- (b) That the Director of Finance and Administration be authorised to submit further representations in support of the Commission's revised recommendations which provide for the creation of two parliamentary constituencies wholly contained within the boundaries of this District, as shown in Appendix 1 to the report.

82. NOTICE OF MOTION.

Cllr. Cullers disagreed in principle with the consideration of this notice of motion, and drew attention to the change in Standing Orders which had been necessary to allow it to be discussed at this meeting. He asked that the motion be withdrawn, but was advised that the motion could only be withdrawn by the Member who had submitted it.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 7, Cllr. Mrs. Robinson moved the following motion:-

'That no objection be raised to the application by Southampton and South West Hampshire Health Authority to increase the level of fluoride to one part per million in the water supply of part of this District'.

Cllr. Mrs. Robinson advised Members that as she had watched the debate on the fluoridation of water supplies she had become increasingly convinced of the improvements it would promote in the dental health of children; while remaining satisfied that there was no health risk. She quoted medical opinion in support of both facets of her argument.

The motion was seconded by Cllr. Lt. Col. Shand.

A number of Members spoke of their strong opposition to proposals to add fluoride to water supplies. They believed that local public opinion, as demonstrated by the post they received on the subject, and by a telephone poll by a local television company, was overwhelmingly against fluoridation. They believed that there were alternative sources of fluoride such as toothpastes, tablets and tooth coatings, which allowed people to retain the element of choice. Some medical

opinion remained concerned about the long-term effects of exposure to fluoride on health, particularly with respect to the immune system, allergies and cancer rates. While any doubt remained, the addition of fluoride could not be justified. People had a right of choice and should not be forced to consume artificial fluorides when they would be of no benefit whatsoever to the majority of the population. Fluoridation would not stop dental caries and it was more important to educate the public on other measures, such as diet, which would.

Other members believed that the addition of fluoride to water would play a significant role in reducing dental caries among children. No other means of protection could be demonstrated to be so effective, or cost effective. It was accepted that poor diet and deprivation were significant causes of dental decay, but it was the children from poorer households who would be at most risk from these factors, while their parents were least likely to seek the alternative forms of protection. They believed that fluoridation would even out the effects of this disadvantage. Education had a role to play, but was a longer-term measure. Action must be taken now. They were satisfied that the bulk of medical and dental opinion both supported the need for fluoridation and was convinced of its safety. Any problems would have been revealed by monitoring areas with naturally high levels of fluoride in their water.

In reply, Cllr. Mrs. Robinson welcomed the full debate which the issue had received. She emphasised the benefits, particularly for children who had no choice in the degree of their exposure to the risk of dental caries. She again emphasised that the bulk of medical opinion was satisfied that fluoridation was safe.

Cllr. Cullers asked that the matter be determined by recorded vote, but in accordance with Standing Order No. 19, insufficient Members indicated their support by rising in their places.

With 16 Members voting in favour, and 32 against, the motion was lost.

83. SEALING OF DOCUMENTS.

RESOLVED:

That the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to any orders, deeds or documents necessary to give effect to any decision made at this meeting.

CHAIRMAN