



24 FEBRUARY 2003

NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the New Forest District Council held at Appletree Court, Lyndhurst on Monday 24 February 2003.

- p Cllr J M Hoy - Chairman
- p Cllr J A G Hutchins - Vice-Chairman

Councillors:

- p Mrs S M Abernethy
- e K F Ault
- p K E Austin
- p G C Beck
- p E R Bowring
- p F J Bright
- p Mrs D M Brooks
- p D S Burdle
- p W R Catt
- p Mrs J L Cleary
- p J E Coles
- e D E Cracknell
- p B D Dash
- p J J Dawson
- p W H Dow
- p Miss P A Drake
- p L T Dunsdon
- p B C Earwicker
- p M H G Fidler
- p Mrs L C Ford
- p R L Frampton
- p Ms C F Gradidge
- p P C Greenfield
- p R C H Hale
- p L E Harris
- p F R Harrison
- p S A Hayes
- p J D Heron

Councillors:

- p P E Hickman
- e Mrs M D Holding
- p Mrs A M Howe
- p Mrs M Humber BA
- p M J Kendal
- e G N D Locock
- p Mrs B M Maynard
- p Mrs M McLean
- p B M F Pemberton
- p A W Rice TD
- p B Rickman
- p Mrs M J Robinson
- p B Rule
- p T M Russell
- p D N Scott
- p M J Shand
- p S A Shepherd
- p Mrs B Smith
- p Mrs L P Snashall
- p G Spikins
- p M H Thierry
- p D B Tipp
- p M S Wade
- p S S Wade
- p C A Wise
- p P R Woods
- p Mrs P A Wyeth

Officers Attending:

D Yates, C Malyon, R Millard, Ms J Bateman, Ms G O'Rourke and Mrs R Rutins.

55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Cllrs Austin, Mrs Brooks, Catt, Dash, Fidler, Greenfield, Mrs Howe, Kendal, Pemberton, Rice, Rickman, Rule, Mrs Smith, Mrs Snashall, Thierry and S S Wade declared interests in Minute 58.

56. MINUTES.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2002 as amended and re-circulated be signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to in Minute 48 (3) the following new paragraph be added immediately before the resolution :- 'In response to a question the Portfolio Holder agreed to write to all members of the Council explaining when the changes would come into force and how outstanding appeals would be dealt with.'

57. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

(a) Cllr Spikins

The Chairman welcomed back Cllr Spikins following his recent ill health. Cllr Spikins replied that he had been grateful to members and officers for their wishes and kind thoughts during his illness.

(b) The Late Councillor N L T Smith

The Chairman reported with great sadness the death of Cllr Nick Smith, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Environment.

The Chairman said that Cllr Smith had made a valuable contribution to the work of the Council and would be sadly missed by all those who had the pleasure of knowing him.

The Chairman had represented the Council at Cllr Smith's funeral two weeks ago. His popularity was apparent by the number of people who went to bid him farewell.

Among the 250 people who filled the church of St Michael and All Angels at Lyndhurst were Dr Julian Lewis, MP; the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council, all of whom paid tribute to Cllr Smith's life.

Cllr Smith's family passed on their sincere thanks to officers and members of the Council for the many message of support and condolences they had received.

Cllr Kendal paid tribute to the work that Cllr Smith had done in relation to the Dibden Bay Inquiry and said that he would be missed as a local councillor as well as a Cabinet member, friend and colleague.

Cllr Dash said that Cllr Smith had had his own genuine set of beliefs and whilst many members came from different perspectives there was a common path and goal.

Cllr Hayes said that Cllr Smith would be remembered especially for his commitment to the issues surrounding the Dibden Bay Inquiry and by his constituents in Marchwood.

(c) Former Councillor Ralph Hayward

The Chairman also announced with regret the death of former Cllr Ralph Hayward on Sunday, 26 January 2003.

Mr Hayward had been a New Forest District Councillor for the Fawley/Holbury Ward from 1976 to 1983. During his term of office he had served on the Planning and Environment Services Committees and also on the Fawley and District Community Association.

(d) Former Councillor John Betteridge

Again with regret the Chairman announced the death of former Cllr John Betteridge who passed away on Thursday, 30 January 2003.

Mr Betteridge had been a Councillor on the former New Forest Rural District Council from 1959 until 1973 and had continued with the New Forest District Council for the Colbury Ward from 1973 until 1979. He was also a member of Hampshire County Council from 1967 to 1974. During his term of office with the Council he had served on the Housing and Environmental Services Committees.

(e) Mrs Jean Austin

The Chairman paid respect to Mrs Jean Austin, the wife of Cllr Austin who passed away on 31 December 2002. Mrs Austin had been a Parish Councillor from 1995 to 1999 representing the Barton Ward.

Members and officers joined the Chairman in standing in a minute of reflection and thanksgiving for the life of Cllr Nick Smith and to remember former Councillors Hayward and Betteridge and Mrs Austin.

(f) Cllr Cracknell

The Chairman reported with pleasure that Cllr Cracknell was now at home after five weeks in hospital. Although his treatment was continuing the prognosis was excellent.

(g) New Year's Honours

The Chairman announced with pleasure three local residents who were recognised in the Queen's New Year Honours List. Mr Jeffery Kitcher, of Beaulieu, had been awarded the MBE for services to commoning and the New Forest. Mrs Yvonne Nelson, of New Milton had been awarded the MBE for services to the Fortune Centre of Riding Therapy of Christchurch; and Mr Norman Noble of Fordingbridge had been awarded the MBE for services to the Police.

58. REPORT OF CABINET.

The Chairman presented the Report of the Cabinet meetings held on 6 January and 5 February 2003. On the motion that the report be received and the recommendations adopted:-

In accordance with Standing Order 66, the Chairman of the Council used his discretion to relax the requirements of the Rules of Debate to give some flexibility to the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group and their seconders when moving their budget proposals.

(a) General Fund Revenue Budget, Housing Revenue Account and Capital Programmes 2003/2004

Cllrs Dash, Kendal and Rice declared personal interests in this item as members of the County Council. They did not consider their interests to be prejudicial. They remained at the meeting, took part in the discussion and voted.

Councillors Brooks and Rickman declared personal and prejudicial interests in this item as Beach Hut owners. There was no debate on that particular issue and they remained at the meeting. They did not vote on that issue.

Cllrs Smith and SS Wade declared personal and prejudicial interests in this item as members of the Waterside CAB. During consideration of the matters relating to the CAB they left the meeting. They did not vote on that issue.

Cllrs Snashall and Thierry declared personal and prejudicial interests in that they rented Council owned garages. There was no debate on that particular issue and they remained at the meeting. They did not vote on that issue.

Cllrs Austin, Catt, Fidler, Greenfield, Howe, Pemberton and Rule declared personal interests as council appointed members of CAB management committees. They did not consider their interests to be prejudicial. They remained at the meeting, took part in the discussion and voted.

The Leader of the Council made a statement on the Administration's proposed budget which was attached as appendix 1 to these minutes. In moving the recommendation the Leader proposed the following two amendments :-

- (i) That the budget be increased by £1,600 to cover the increase in the charge for meals on wheels following the decision by the County Council; and
- (ii) That the £109,091 Planning Delivery Grant be allocated to reserves pending an early report to Cabinet detailing the most appropriate use of the money to ensure maximum benefit to the Council.

Members considered a revised Appendix 1 to the Report to Cabinet together with revised recommendations detailing the changes that would arise as a result of those two amendments. (This document is attached as Appendix 5 to these minutes).

The Finance and Support Portfolio Holder seconded the recommendation and the proposed amendments and made a statement which is attached as Appendix 2 to these minutes.

The Leader of the Opposition then made a statement which is attached as Appendix 3 to these minutes and moved an amendment giving alternative budget proposals for 2003/2004 as detailed in Appendices 3 and 4.

The shadow Portfolio Holder for Finance and Support, in seconding the Leader of the Opposition's amendment, made a presentation to the Council which is attached as Appendix 4 to these minutes.

Other members then discussed the detail of the budget proposals.

Members agreed that there had been an obvious change in Government policy with the north of the country now receiving a higher percentage of grant funding.

A member said that the Liberal Democrats had had a 4 year plan and had built up reserves to plan for any loss of grant. In their proposed budget they had allocated £30,000 for the introduction of Area Committees to open up local government to local people. Other members said that £30,000 would be insufficient to set up Area based committees that would be effective.

In terms of the issues surrounding the grant to the Citizens' Advice Bureaux (CAB), a member said that the CAB worked hard to raise their own funds and that the current grant agreed by the Council was insufficient. As part of the Liberal Democrat's budget proposals they would give the CAB an extra £66,000 in 2003/2004. Other members felt that the appropriate grant funding had been awarded to the CAB.

A member commented that support was needed for Totton and its local traders in the absence of a Town Centre Manager. It was noted that Totton was very high on the Council's list of priorities and the Town Council had already been asked to come forward with proposals. The role of Town Centre Co-ordinator was also being actively considered.

Other members commented that the Government were stifling spending and were moving costs away from the centre to local council taxes. A lot of the proposals in the Liberal Democrat budget were already being done by the Council. Despite central Government putting the burden of bureaucracy onto Local Government the Council had still managed to limit the Council tax rise to 3.5%.

A member said during their term of office the Liberal Democrats had raised Council Tax by 48% and at that time the Council were threatened with being capped by the District Auditor.

In terms of the Environmental Health out of hours service the Portfolio Holder said that there continued to be insufficient police cover to provide the Council's officers with the appropriate back-up they required when on call out of hours.

In summing up the Leader of the Liberal Democrats said that whilst there was concern for authorities that provided Education and Social Services this Council was not one of them. Now might be an appropriate time for the Government to look at ways of funding local government other than through council tax. During the term of office of her Group she was not aware at any time that the Council had been in danger of being capped. She commented that Area based committees would give greater accountability to the public and should be pursued. The Liberal Democrats wanted a better working relationship with the CAB. They would also wish to re-introduce the Environmental Health out of hours service with appropriate security.

The Leader of the Council in summing up, said that every efficiency saving that the Council had introduced had been opposed by the Liberal Democrats. In the last year of the Liberal Democrat administration they had underspent by £1.3m but at the same time maintained long term leasing agreements. The Council had changed their policy from leasing to purchasing where possible and, as a result costs were now reducing. He agreed that the CAB were an excellent organisation and the Council had increased their funding by 32% since the Conservatives had taken office. The CAB had not said in detail how they had reached their budget figures. However, they had increased all their managers' salaries which had left them with a budget shortfall of £14,000. The County Council were giving consideration to the making of a grant for 2003/2004 of this sum.

Upon a vote the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition was lost.

Upon a vote the two amendments proposed by the Leader of the Council were carried.

(b) Statement by Leader of the Council on Traffic Management Consultants Report

The Leader said that he was pleased that the results of the public consultation showed that people agreed that the current parking enforcement procedures were inadequate and that the Council should take on that particular role. The powers in the 1991 Road Traffic Act decriminalised parking and would enable the Council to take on enforcement powers and use the monies raised from car parking charges to fund an enhanced parking service. There would be consistency between On and Off Street Parking arrangements as they would be carried out by the same body.

Members discussed the detail of the scheme.

A member said that there would need to be a detailed look at individual areas in order to tailor the scheme to local needs. For example in Totton it was felt that it was unlikely that the scheme would pay for itself. The Scheme should be able to be customised to ensure 'best income' in individual car parks.

Some members said that for the Council to take on the role was right for the New Forest and would bring them in line with surrounding authorities. It was an excellent way of relieving traffic congestion. The current two tier system was too confusing and if the Council took on responsibility for both On and Off street parking that would provide a more holistic approach. Some members said that the previous scheme had had an adverse effect on village traders but that the new scheme met the requirements of traders and was supported by the New Milton Chamber of Commerce.

With relation to Off Street parking some members were of the view that fines for non payment of charges were a necessary element of the scheme to ensure that all costs were covered. Charging was only proposed as part of the management of the scheme to ensure that the costs were not borne by the Council Tax payer.

Some members said that any scheme should treat residents and visitors differently. 58% of people questioned thought that only visitors should pay charges. Car Parking should be considered as an income source. The only alternative to charging visitors would be to charge the Council Tax payer which was not acceptable.

Other members said that the proposed system with a one off payment for a clock was much easier. However, a charging system on its own would not be sufficient to manage traffic problems. A Clock system would provide the cheapest method of control whilst at the same time producing income from visitors.

It was moved and seconded that the following amendments be made to the recommendations as set out in Item 12 of the Cabinet report:-

- (i) Add after HCC

'the police and town and parish councils'.

Following a vote it was agreed that the words ' the Police' be added as indicated to (i).

- (ii) after Forestry Commission, add 'the County Council and other relevant organisations on car parking issues'.

Following a vote the amendment was agreed.

- (b) replace with:

‘That a Scheme for parking in Council owned car parks, based on free residents’ permits and charging for visitors, be introduced following consultation’.

Following a vote the amendment was lost.

- (c) After ‘That’ and before ‘the Economy and Planning Review Panel’ insert ‘ within the next two months’.

Following a vote the amendment was lost.

The substantive motion was then put and upon a vote it was:

RESOLVED:

- (a) That officers be requested to:
- (i) begin discussions with Hampshire County Council and the Police on the decriminalisation of on-street parking and undertaking local enforcement, and take appropriate steps to pursue this matter subject to reference back of details;
 - (ii) hold discussions with the Forestry Commission, the County Council and other relevant organisations on car parking issues to enable liaison between the Commission and the Council on car parking issues;
- (b) That a scheme for parking in Council owned car parks (based on a clock system charged at £5 per annum including the option of meter charging at a rate equivalent to approximately £0.50p per hour) be introduced following full consultation with Town and Parish Councils; and
- (c) That the Economy and Planning Review Panel be requested to consider the details of a future scheme for traffic management, for subsequent recommendation to the Cabinet, and Council if appropriate.

In accordance with Standing Order 55 Councillor Earwicker asked that his votes against (b) and (c) above be recorded.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the Cabinet dated 6 January and 5 February, 2003 be received and the recommendations as revised (see Appendix 5) adopted.

59. GENERAL PURPOSES AND LICENSING COMMITTEE.

The Chairman presented the report of the General Purposes and Licensing Committee held on 17 January, 2003. On the motion that the report be received and the recommendation adopted it was:

RESOLVED:

That the report be received and the recommendation adopted.

60. STANDARDS COMMITTEE.

The Chairman presented the report of the Standards Committee held on 10 January, 2003. On the motion that the report be received and the recommendations adopted it was:

RESOLVED:

That the report be received and the recommendations adopted.

61. APPOINTMENTS TO REVIEW PANELS.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That Councillor Beck be appointed to the Health and Social Inclusion Review Panel in place of Cllr Drake;
- (b) That Cllr Ford be appointed to the Environment Review Panel in place of Cllr Woods;
- (c) That Cllr Kendal be appointed to the Industrial Relations Committee in place of Cllrs Hayes; and
- (d) That the appointments to the New Forest District Council/Test Valley Borough Council Commercial Services Joint Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be deferred.

62. PORTFOLIO HOLDERS' QUESTION TIME.

Question No. 1 from: Cllr Pemberton to Cllr Wise, Finance and Support Portfolio Holder

Would the Finance and Support Portfolio Holder please explain the implications to this Council of the recent changes by the Government in the method of annual grant funding to local authorities, in particular with regard to the likely effect on future Council Tax payers' proportionate funding of the Council's total expenditure?

Answer:

In view of the shortage of time Cllr Pemberton withdrew this question.

Question No. 2 from: Cllr Catt to Cllr Wise, Finance and Support Portfolio Holder

Would Cllr Wise please explain the policy relating to the proposed increased charges for the use of various Council amenity facilities?

Answer:

In view of the shortage of time Cllr Catt asked that this question be held over to the next meeting of the Council.

Question No. 3 from: Cllr Thierry to Cllr Woods, Environment Portfolio Holder

Would the Portfolio Holder please explain to the Council the position regarding the funding arrangements within the Partnership of Project Integra and what proposals he believes Project Integra should consider in the future concerning partnership funding.

Answer:

The Council's position regarding the funding arrangements within the partnership of Project Integra is that the Council fully supports the compromise reached by officers at the meeting on 19 February, 2003. Funding of the Project Integra Executive should be by annual subscription based on population. In order to fund the cost of £153,000 for the Project Integra Executive, this Council was committed to a subscription in 2003/2004 of £12,543.

Project Integra also undertook joint waste management projects. It had been agreed that those projects would be funded in 2003/2004 by allowing Project Integra to retain a proportion of the income accrued from the sale of recyclables. In 2004/2005 and subsequent years, projects would also be funded by income share. The Council considered that a subscription was the most equitable and sustainable way to fund Project Integra and completely supported this approach to funding. New Forest District Council remained fully committed to the Project Integra partnership and was a very active member of the project both at officer and member level.

Question No. 4 from: Cllr Shepherd to Cllr Woods, Environment Portfolio Holder

At the last board meeting of Project Integra this administration refused to accept the principle of using the income derived from the sale of recycled material for the promotion and advertising of recycling, and requested its share of income be returned.

It has also suggested a system of funding that is more equitable to all members be pursued.

In his letter to board members Cllr Kendal accepts that this review of funding will take time, and suggests a new funding regime could be in place for 2004/2005.

Given this time frame, and the commitment of the new portfolio holder to "being committed to finding ways in which the environmental well-being of the district can be enhanced", along with Cllr Kendal's observation of his "thoughtful common sense approach to most matters" Can the portfolio holder give this council an assurance, that during this review process he will not jeopardise any short term funding issues that might have long-term environmental implications, or potentially affect the cohesion of the partnership?

Answer:

The Portfolio Holder replied that he had no hesitation in giving the Council his assurance that the review of the funding arrangements for Project Integra would not jeopardise the partnership.

He again reiterated that New Forest District Council was fully committed to the Project Integra Partnership and remained very active at both officer and member level.

The proposed agreement accorded with the Leader of the Council's statement that a new funding mechanism would be in place for 2004/05. The income share mechanism for 2003/2004 allowed for a transition from the old funding arrangements towards a more equitable and sustainable way to fund Project Integra. It also ensured that there would be sufficient funding in 2003/2004 to allow Project Integra to develop and to support environmental projects.

Question No. 5 from: Cllr Scott to Cllr Greenfield, Housing Portfolio Holder

Would the portfolio holder please detail the tenant participation arrangements and specifically the consultation process which occurred when the recent rent increase was discussed with tenants ?

Answer:

In view of the shortage of time Cllr Scott asked that this question be held over to the next meeting of the Council.

63. THE 2003/2004 COUNCIL TAX (REPORT B).

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that at its meeting on 16 December 2002 the Council calculated the following amounts for the year 2003/04 in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992: -

- (a) 69,483.70 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.

(b) **LOCAL COUNCIL AREA**

ASHURST & COLBURY	905.10
BEAULIEU	484.00
BOLDRE	1,018.90
BRAMSHAW	337.30
BRANSGORE	1,839.70
BREAMORE	171.00
BROCKENHURST	1,736.30
BURLEY	754.00
COPYTHORNE	1,200.80
DAMERHAM	233.00
DENNY LODGE	144.70
EAST BOLDRE	382.00
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	579.50
EXBURY & LEPE	98.60
FAWLEY	4,792.60
FORDINGBRIDGE	2,281.10
GODSHILL	209.90
HALE	270.60
HORDLE	2,351.20
HYDE	494.80
HYPHE & DIBDEN	7,480.50
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	6,589.30
LYNDHURST	1,357.70
MARCHWOOD	2,016.50
MARTIN	188.60
MILFORD-ON-SEA	2,537.90
MINSTEAD	351.70
NETLEY MARSH	815.30
NEW MILTON	10,450.00
RINGWOOD	5,272.50
ROCKBOURNE	163.00
SANDLEHEATH	264.50
SOPLEY	286.60
SWAY	1,607.50
TOTTON & ELING	9,469.00
WHITSBURY	100.60
WOODGREEN	247.40
	<hr/>
	69,483.70

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.

- (c) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2003/04 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992: -
- (i) £79,633,740 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.
 - (ii) £57,455,250 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.
 - (iii) £22,178,490 being the amount by which the aggregate at (i) above exceeds the aggregate at (ii) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
 - (iv) £10,394,720 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, increased by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its collection fund to its general fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (Council Tax Surplus), and increased by the amount of any sum which the Council estimates will be transferred from its collection fund to its general fund pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charges) directions under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (Community Charge Surplus).
 - (v) £169.59 being the amount at (iii) above less the amount at (iv) above, all divided by the amount at (i) 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.
 - (vi) £3,110,480 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.

(vii) £124.82 being the amount at (v) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (vi) above by the amount at (a) 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.

(viii) Local Council Area

	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	145.81
BEAULIEU	133.08
BOLDRE	140.75
BRAMSHAW	142.61
BRANSGORE	151.45
BREAMORE	145.29
BROCKENHURST	146.71
BURLEY	133.44
COPYTHORNE	132.15
DAMERHAM	141.99
DENNY LODGE	152.46
EAST BOLDRE	135.29
ELLINGHAM	
HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	139.49
EXBURY & LEPE	131.92
FAWLEY	206.11
FORDINGBRIDGE	182.70
GODSHILL	158.17
HALE	142.37
HORDLE	142.65
HYDE	135.94
HYPHE & DIBDEN	174.61
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	175.20
LYNDHURST	136.60
MARCHWOOD	196.94
MARTIN	143.38
MILFORD-ON-SEA	149.10
MINSTEAD	141.88
NETLEY MARSH	133.88
NEW MILTON	162.06
RINGWOOD	168.06
ROCKBOURNE	143.22
SANDLEHEATH	139.94
SOPLEY	154.48
SWAY	151.57
TOTTON & ELING	202.30
WHITSBURY	138.74
WOODGREEN	134.52

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at (vii) 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) 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.

(ix) **PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA**

These are the District plus Town/Parish Council elements only.

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	97.21	113.41	129.61	145.81	178.21	210.61	243.02	291.62
BEAULIEU	88.72	103.51	118.29	133.08	162.65	192.23	221.80	266.16
BOLDRE	93.83	109.47	125.11	140.75	172.03	203.31	234.58	281.50
BRAMSHAW	95.07	110.92	126.76	142.61	174.30	205.99	237.68	285.22
BRANSGORE	100.97	117.79	134.62	151.45	185.11	218.76	252.42	302.90
BREAMORE	96.86	113.00	129.15	145.29	177.58	209.86	242.15	290.58
BROCKENHURST	97.81	114.11	130.41	146.71	179.31	211.91	244.52	293.42
BURLEY	88.96	103.79	118.61	133.44	163.09	192.75	222.40	266.88
COPYTHORNE	88.10	102.78	117.47	132.15	161.52	190.88	220.25	264.30
DAMERHAM	94.66	110.44	126.21	141.99	173.54	205.10	236.65	283.98
DENNY LODGE	101.64	118.58	135.52	152.46	186.34	220.22	254.10	304.92
EAST BOLDRE	90.19	105.23	120.26	135.29	165.35	195.42	225.48	270.58
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	92.99	108.49	123.99	139.49	170.49	201.49	232.48	278.98
EXBURY & LEPE	87.95	102.60	117.26	131.92	161.24	190.55	219.87	263.84
FAWLEY	137.41	160.31	183.21	206.11	251.91	297.71	343.52	412.22
FORDINGBRIDGE	121.80	142.10	162.40	182.70	223.30	263.90	304.50	365.40
GODSHILL	105.45	123.02	140.60	158.17	193.32	228.47	263.62	316.34
HALE	94.91	110.73	126.55	142.37	174.01	205.65	237.28	284.74
HORDLE	95.10	110.95	126.80	142.65	174.35	206.05	237.75	285.30
HYDE	90.63	105.73	120.84	135.94	166.15	196.36	226.57	271.88
HYTHE & DIBDEN	116.41	135.81	155.21	174.61	213.41	252.21	291.02	349.22
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	116.80	136.27	155.73	175.20	214.13	253.07	292.00	350.40
LYNDHURST	91.07	106.24	121.42	136.60	166.96	197.31	227.67	273.20
MARCHWOOD	131.29	153.18	175.06	196.94	240.70	284.47	328.23	393.88
MARTIN	95.59	111.52	127.45	143.38	175.24	207.10	238.97	286.76
MILFORD-ON- SEA	99.40	115.97	132.53	149.10	182.23	215.37	248.50	298.20
MINSTEAD	94.59	110.35	126.12	141.88	173.41	204.94	236.47	283.76
NETLEY MARSH	89.25	104.13	119.00	133.88	163.63	193.38	223.13	267.76
NEW MILTON	108.04	126.05	144.05	162.06	198.07	234.09	270.10	324.12
RINGWOOD	112.04	130.71	149.39	168.06	205.41	242.75	280.10	336.12
ROCKBOURNE	95.48	111.39	127.31	143.22	175.05	206.87	238.70	286.44

SANDLEHEATH	93.29	108.84	124.39	139.94	171.04	202.14	233.23	279.88
SOPLEY	102.99	120.15	137.32	154.48	188.81	223.14	257.47	308.96
SWAY	101.05	117.89	134.73	151.57	185.25	218.93	252.62	303.14
TOTTON & ELING	134.87	157.34	179.82	202.30	247.26	292.21	337.17	404.60
WHITSBURY	92.49	107.91	123.32	138.74	169.57	200.40	231.23	277.48
WOODGREEN	89.68	104.63	119.57	134.52	164.41	194.31	224.20	269.04

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (vii) and (viii) 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.

- (d) That it be noted that for the year 2003/04 the Hampshire County Council and the Hampshire Police Authority have 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

PRECEPTING AUTHORITY	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	563.04	656.88	750.72	844.56	1,032.24	1,219.92	1,407.60	1,689.12
HAMPSHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY	64.86	75.67	86.48	97.29	118.91	140.53	162.15	194.58
	627.90	732.55	837.20	941.85	1,151.15	1,360.45	1,569.75	1,883.70

- (e) That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (ix) and (d) 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 2003/04 for each of the categories of dwellings as shown:-

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	725.11	845.96	966.81	1,087.66	1,329.36	1,571.06	1,812.77	2,175.32
BEAULIEU	716.62	836.06	955.49	1,074.93	1,313.80	1,552.68	1,791.55	2,149.86
BOLDRE	721.73	842.02	962.31	1,082.60	1,323.18	1,563.76	1,804.33	2,165.20
BRAMSHAW	722.97	843.47	963.96	1,084.46	1,325.45	1,566.44	1,807.43	2,168.92
BRANGSORE	728.87	850.34	971.82	1,093.30	1,336.26	1,579.21	1,822.17	2,186.60
BREAMORE	724.76	845.55	966.35	1,087.14	1,328.73	1,570.31	1,811.90	2,174.28
BROCKENHURST	725.71	846.66	967.61	1,088.56	1,330.46	1,572.36	1,814.27	2,177.12
BURLEY	716.86	836.34	955.81	1,075.29	1,314.24	1,553.20	1,792.15	2,150.58
COPYTHORNE	716.00	835.33	954.67	1,074.00	1,312.67	1,551.33	1,790.00	2,148.00
DAMERHAM	722.56	842.99	963.41	1,083.84	1,324.69	1,565.55	1,806.40	2,167.68
DENNY LODGE	729.54	851.13	972.72	1,094.31	1,337.49	1,580.67	1,823.85	2,188.62
EAST BOLDRE	718.09	837.78	957.46	1,077.14	1,316.50	1,555.87	1,795.23	2,154.28
ELLINGHAM								
HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	720.89	841.04	961.19	1,081.34	1,321.64	1,561.94	1,802.23	2,162.68
EXBURY & LEPE	715.85	835.15	954.46	1,073.77	1,312.39	1,551.00	1,789.62	2,147.54
FAWLEY	765.31	892.86	1,020.41	1,147.96	1,403.06	1,658.16	1,913.27	2,295.92
FORDINGBRIDGE	749.70	874.65	999.60	1,124.55	1,374.45	1,624.35	1,874.25	2,249.10
GODSHILL	733.35	855.57	977.80	1,100.02	1,344.47	1,588.92	1,833.37	2,200.04
HALE	722.81	843.28	963.75	1,084.22	1,325.16	1,566.10	1,807.03	2,168.44
HORDLE	723.00	843.50	964.00	1,084.50	1,325.50	1,566.50	1,807.50	2,169.00
HYDE	718.53	838.28	958.04	1,077.79	1,317.30	1,556.81	1,796.32	2,155.58
HYPHE & DIBDEN	744.31	868.36	992.41	1,116.46	1,364.56	1,612.66	1,860.77	2,232.92
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	744.70	868.82	992.93	1,117.05	1,365.28	1,613.52	1,861.75	2,234.10
LYNDHURST	718.97	838.79	958.62	1,078.45	1,318.11	1,557.76	1,797.42	2,156.90
MARCHWOOD	759.19	885.73	1,012.26	1,138.79	1,391.85	1,644.92	1,897.98	2,277.58
MARTIN	723.49	844.07	964.65	1,085.23	1,326.39	1,567.55	1,808.72	2,170.46
MILFORD-ON-SEA	727.30	848.52	969.73	1,090.95	1,333.38	1,575.82	1,818.25	2,181.90
MINSTEAD	722.49	842.90	963.32	1,083.73	1,324.56	1,565.39	1,806.22	2,167.46
NETLEY MARSH	717.15	836.68	956.20	1,075.73	1,314.78	1,553.83	1,792.88	2,151.46
NEW MILTON	735.94	858.60	981.25	1,103.91	1,349.22	1,594.54	1,839.85	2,207.82
RINGWOOD	739.94	863.26	986.59	1,109.91	1,356.56	1,603.20	1,849.85	2,219.82
ROCKBOURNE	723.38	843.94	964.51	1,085.07	1,326.20	1,567.32	1,808.45	2,170.14
SANDLEHEATH	721.19	841.39	961.59	1,081.79	1,322.19	1,562.59	1,802.98	2,163.58
SOPLEY	730.89	852.70	974.52	1,096.33	1,339.96	1,583.59	1,827.22	2,192.66
SWAY	728.95	850.44	971.93	1,093.42	1,336.40	1,579.38	1,822.37	2,186.84
TOTTON & ELING	762.77	889.89	1,017.02	1,144.15	1,398.41	1,652.66	1,906.92	2,288.30
WHITSBURY	720.39	840.46	960.52	1,080.59	1,320.72	1,560.85	1,800.98	2,161.18
WOODGREEN	717.58	837.18	956.77	1,076.37	1,315.56	1,554.76	1,793.95	2,152.74

CHAIRMAN