

25 FEBRUARY 2004

NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the New Forest District Council held at Appletree Court, Lyndhurst on Wednesday, 25 February 2004.

- p Cllr J A G Hutchins - Chairman
- p Cllr Lt Col M J Shand - Vice-Chairman

Councillors:

- p G Abbott
- e K F Ault
- p K E Austin
- p C Baker
- p G C Beck
- p Mrs J L Cleary
- p D E Cracknell
- p G F Dart
- p W H Dow
- p Miss P A Drake
- p L T Dunsdon
- p M H G Fidler
- p Ms L C Ford
- p P C Greenfield
- p R C H Hale
- p C J Harrison
- p D Harrison
- p F R Harrison
- p J D Heron
- p D A Hibbert
- p P E Hickman
- p Mrs M D Holding
- p J M Hoy
- p Mrs M Humber
- p M J Kendal
- e Mrs B M Maynard
- p Mrs M McLean
- p M J Molyneux
- p R J Neath

Councillors:

- p G J Parkes
- p B M F Pemberton
- p J Penwarden
- p L R Puttock
- p A W Rice TD
- p B Rickman
- p Mrs M J Robinson
- p B Rule
- p D J Russell
- p T M Russell
- p D N Scott
- p N E Scott
- p S A Shepherd
- p Mrs B Smith
- p Mrs L P Snashall
- p Mrs S I Snowden
- p M H Thierry
- p A R Tinsley
- p D B Tipp
- p Mrs B Vincent
- p M S Wade
- p S S Wade
- p G M Walmsley
- p J G Ward
- p A Weeks
- p Dr M N Whitehead
- p C A Wise
- e P R Woods
- p Mrs P A Wyeth

Officers Attending:

D Yates, N Gibbs, C Malyon, J Mascall, Ms J Bateman, Miss G O'Rourke and Mrs R Rutins.

51. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Cllrs Beck, Heron, Hutchins, Ms Ford, Snowden, Rice and Thierry declared interests in Minute 55. (Street Trading Proposals For New Milton).

Messrs Gibbs, Malyon and Mascall declared interests in Minute 55 (Pay for Senior Officers)

52. MINUTES.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2004, having been circulated, be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

53. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

(a) Councillor Lee Dunsdon

The Chairman welcomed back to the Council Cllr Dunsdon who had been elected on 5 February 2004 to the district ward of Holbury and North Blackfield. Cllr Dunsdon had previously served on the Council from May 1999 until the elections in May 2003.

(b) Mr Peter East

The Chairman reported that this was Mr East's last Council meeting before he retired in March, after 37 years reporting for the Echo at Southampton. Mr East had been a familiar friendly face to all the Councillors and officers at New Forest and members joined the Chairman in wishing him a very long and happy retirement.

54. REPORT OF CABINET.

The Chairman presented the report of the Cabinet held on 7 January and 4 February 2004. On the motion that the report be received and the recommendations adopted:

(a) The Local Government Act 2003 – Implications for Council Tax

A member said that the Liberal Democrats were not in favour of the current Council Tax system which they considered was unfair particularly to those on fixed and low incomes. The 50% discount for second homes that had previously been given was only possible as it was subsidised by others.

The Leader of the Council responded and said that the Council Tax had reached unacceptable levels. The problem arose because of the extent to which the Government maintained the grant system. The electorate were now taxed through indirect council tax rather than through income tax and therefore, there would always be inequalities. When the council tax discount on second homes had been debated in the past it was at a time when house prices were lower and there had been less demand on affordable housing. The situation had now changed. The additional money raised as a result of reducing the discount on second homes would be put towards providing more affordable accommodation within the district.

(b) General Fund Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2004/2005

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

Item 9 - General Fund budget recommendation (a) - the addition of the following wording :

"That additional budgetary provision of £13,000 be made in respect of Rural Assistance Grant to be funded from anticipated savings arising from the Council's 'Excellent' status".

The Leader said that the following District Councillors would be involved in the initiative:

Ward	Councillors
Ashurst, Copythorne South and Netley Marsh	Puttock and Tipp
Boldre and Sway	Rickman and Wise
Bramshaw, Copythorne North and Minstead	D Scott
Bransgore and Burley	Greenfield and Penwarden
Brockenhurst and Forest South East	Mrs Holding and Neath
Downlands and Forest	Dr Whitehead
Fawley, Blackfield and Langley	Fidler and Mrs Maynard
Fordingbridge	Hale and Shand
Forest North West	Dow
Furzedown and Hardley	Parkes
Holbury and North Blackfield	Baker and Dunsdon
Hordle	Hoy and Tinsley
Lyndhurst	Mrs Wyeth
Marchwood	Mrs Snashall and Walmsley

Ward	Councillors
Milford	Kendal and Pemberton
Ringwood East and Sopley	Miss Drake

The Finance and Support Portfolio Holder seconded the recommendation and the proposed amendment and, in doing so, especially thanked the Director of Resources for his hard work throughout the year in managing the Council's finances.

The Leader of the Opposition then made a statement that was attached as appendix 2 to these minutes and moved an amendment giving alternative budget proposals for 2004/2005 as detailed in appendices 3 and 4.

Cllr Baker seconded the Leader of the Opposition's amendment.

Other members then discussed the detail of the budget proposals.

A member said that the Leader, in moving the budget, had only spoken about the last seven years but the Government had made tax cuts, cuts in grants and reductions such as funding to NHS dentists before this. Local people now wanted action to be taken. The budget as proposed by the Leader, was out of control with monies from traffic management just being used to keep the Council Tax down. Other members said that the reduction in grants from central government was a part of the problem but, if managed properly, would be welcomed as it would give greater independence if the Council could raise its own funds. The Council Tax structure itself was the other part of the problem.

Other members said that, particularly for pensioners, the Council Tax increase needed to be kept to a minimum without jeopardising the provision of services. Country wide there was over a £1b of unclaimed council tax benefit.

In seconding the Leader of the Opposition's amendment, Cllr Baker said that, whilst the Council were judged as excellent and improving in terms of CPA, the budgeting arrangements still needed to be improved. During 2002/03 there had been £1.3m of supplementary spending in addition to the original budget. This was not a good example of how budget planning should be carried out. There was likely to be a significant underspend in the current year. Why was this money in the budget in the first place if there was not a pressing need to spend it?

In commenting on the Leader of the Council's amendment, the Finance and Support Portfolio Holder said that the proposal in respect of the Rural Assistance Grant was imaginative and was well worth piloting. There would be a review after 9 months. In terms of the Council's expenditure generally

there had been strenuous efforts to maintain budgets. The early repayment of debt had helped to lower the Council tax by reducing interest payments. He said that the Liberal Democrat's proposed budget was not sustainable. The Council's budgetary arrangements were sound and this had been confirmed recently by the District Auditor.

In summing up, the Leader of the Liberal Democrats said that there was no need to allocate an additional £75,000 to the budget from the Council Tax as there would be £7.3m in the capital reserves by 2007 in any case. The principle of devolving Rural Assistance Grant to local members would result in inequality and this needed clarifying.

The Leader of the Council in summing up, said that he agreed that there was a need to strengthen business efficiency particularly in relation to expenditure on ICT. The financial monitoring in the Council was continually being improved and Review Panel Chairmen were becoming more involved in their individual areas of expertise. The traffic management proposals were proceeding as forecast and Hampshire County Council had allocated £150,000 in their budget for decriminalisation measures. The Council would continue to allocate revenue contributions to capital balances to ensure that money was available to repair the Council's assets. The Council would ensure that Council tax benefits for pensioners were well advertised.

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

Upon a vote the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Council was carried.

(c) Comprehensive Performance Assessment

The Leader of the Council said that whilst the Council had been judged as excellent under the Comprehensive Performance Assessment process it was also an improving Council. Overall the Leader said that he was very proud of the assessment. Without effective Opposition the Council would not be outstanding. The result had been a team effort of all members and officers.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the Cabinet dated 7 January and 4 February 2004 be received and the recommendations as amended be adopted.

55. REPORT OF GENERAL PURPOSES AND LICENSING COMMITTEE.

In view of the Chairman of the Council's declared interest, the Vice-Chairman of the Council took the Chair for this item.

Mr N Gibbs, Director of Community Services; Mr C Malyon, Director of Resources and Mr J Mascal, Director of Commercial Services declared direct pecuniary interests in Item no. 1 – Pay for Senior Officers (16 January 2004). They left the meeting during consideration of that item.

Cllrs Beck, Hutchins, Rice and Mrs Snowden declared personal and prejudicial interests as members of New Milton Town Council who were the proposers of the Street Market. They left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Cllrs Heron, Ms Ford and Thierry declared personal and prejudicial interests as members of Ringwood Town Council who had formally objected to the proposed Street Market. They left the meeting during consideration of this item.

The Chairman presented the report of the General Purposes and Licensing Committee held on 16 January 2004 and 23 February 2004. On the motion that the report be received and the recommendations adopted it was:

RESOLVED:

That the report be received and the recommendations adopted.

The Chairman of the Council resumed the Chair.

56. PORTFOLIO HOLDERS' QUESTION TIME.

Question No. 1 from : Cllr Hibbert to Cllr Holding, Portfolio Holder, Health and Social Inclusion

“Can the Portfolio Holder for Health and Social Inclusion please explain what steps are being taken to improve NHS Dentistry provision within the NFDC area?”

Answer:

In view of time constraints Cllr Hibbert deferred his question to the next meeting of the Council.

Question 2 from: Cllr Pemberton to Cllr Beck, Portfolio Holder, Crime and Disorder

“Would the Portfolio Holder for Crime and Disorder please indicate the progress he has been able to make with the Police Authorities to improve the Police presence in the New Forest following his most successful recent rally in New Milton and the excellent number of petitions he was able to obtain, representing half the population of that town and which were handed over to the local Inspector”.

Answer:

The Portfolio Holder responded that he had made little progress as the Chief Constable had made it abundantly clear in the press and on television, radio and at meetings that he was not prepared to rethink his decision to reduce the number of police constables in the New Forest by 10 posts, and a similar number of posts in the south east Hampshire town of Petersfield. These 20 constables would be re-deployed in areas of high crime within the County. The Resource Allocation Formula had been applied to the New Forest Base Command Unit (BCU) and on that basis, with effect from April, the New Milton and Lymington Police sectors would amalgamate to form a single unit, under the banner of the New Forest South Sector.

That sector would be under the command of Inspector John Heath, who currently had a full time job looking after the ever increasing young persons' problems in New Milton. Inspector Gerry Hutchins, at present in command of the Lymington Sector would move to the BCU at Lyndhurst. There would be no closure of police stations and public opening hours would not be reduced. A beat team would be based at New Milton with Lymington, the larger site, operating as a response policing base for the entire sector.

That decision had not been accepted lightly by either the traders or the residents of New Milton who felt they were being 'short changed' as their police precept had increased by over 50% in a very short period and the service had notably decreased. The town had also been unsuccessful in a recent Home Office bid to introduce CCTV into the Town.

A petition had been organised by the Milton, Barton and Becton Conservatives supported by the New Milton Chamber of Commerce and the Barton Residents' Association and within a short period of 10 days 9,200 residents representing 37% of the population signed the petition to express their displeasure at what they felt was the down-grading of the New Milton Police Station, the sharing of their Inspector, the reduction of 10 posts and the lack of communication on the part of the Police. At a public rally held on Saturday, 7 February 2004 and attended by some 300 plus residents and addressed by both Desmond Swayne MP and the Leader of the New Forest District Council, Mel Kendal, a petition was delivered to Inspector Heath by Desmond Swayne, and passed to the Chief Constable.

In the wake of the Rally the Portfolio Holder had attended a public meeting held in Petersfield on which occasion a petition of 3000 signatures was handed to the Chief Constable by the residents of that town. The Portfolio Holder had been able to speak with the Chief Constable and informed him that whilst he was au'fait with his decision not to contemplate a change of mind, in a democratic society he felt he had a moral duty to listen to and communicate with the people of the grass roots, to which the Chief Constable replied, "give more cake (funding) and I will share it out." Superintendent Barrie Talbot who heads the New Forest Police advised he had no option but to divert resources from the west of the district to Hythe and the Waterside.

The Portfolio Holder said he was of the opinion that registering the concern of this Council and the residents of the New Forest to the reduction of ten police constables' posts was right and proper. The efficiency or otherwise of the rationale plan was a matter of time, as members were well aware with effect from midnight Wednesday last Hampshire County Constabulary adopted powers given to them under the Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003. These powers would only be effective if they were enforced and this could only be achieved if there were officers on the streets. This unwanted situation was the result of the Government not fulfilling their much publicised commitment of more Police officers on our streets. That might be the case in the urban areas but this was at the expense of the rural areas.

Question 3 from: Cllr Fidler to Cllr Thierry, Portfolio Holder, Environment

"Will the portfolio holder confirm that the plan to replace the old toilets and Cafe at Calshot with a privately funded scheme had limited interest from the private sector and may not now proceed".

Answer:

The Portfolio Holder replied that for the past 18 months officers of the Council had been examining ways in which the existing public conveniences and rundown beach cafe could be re-provided at Calshot Spit.

Following an extensive marketing campaign, with over 50 information packs being sent out, finally one lead partner/developer emerged. Over the preceding 12 months discussions had been ongoing with this developer.

It had been the partner's intention to work with a voluntary organisation, to provide the catering element and management of the cafe. Unfortunately that organisation had now formally withdrawn their interest.

The major partner remained eager to proceed and discussions were actively taking place between the Council and the partner to seek a way forward.

There were still a number of issues that needed to be agreed with the lead partner, they included planning and lease terms – it was therefore unlikely that the Calshot enhancement programme would proceed before the Autumn. No contractual arrangements had been finalised and either party might yet withdraw.

While it was possible that an agreement might be concluded with the interested lead partner the uncertainty in the current situation allowed the Council to re-assess the overall project and to evaluate the toilet, cafe provision and indeed other opportunities which the Council might deem acceptable for the site at Calshot Spit.

Clearly there were a number of options available to the Council and these needed to be explored and considered before a final decision was made should the discussions with the lead partner ultimately fail.

Whilst the Portfolio Holder could not outline what those options and opportunities might be, he assured members that the established and normal Council procedures would be adhered to, consultation being part of that decision making process.

The Council understood the expectations of the people who enjoyed this very special area of the Solent, both visitors and residents.

The Council's objective would still endeavour to provide the right mix of facilities at Calshot Spit for the continual enjoyment of that leisure area.

57. BY-ELECTION FOR HOLBURY/NORTH BLACKFIELD WARD – 5 FEBRUARY 2004 – REPORT BY THE RETURNING OFFICER (REPORT B).

RESOLVED:

That the results of the by-election held on 5 February, 2004 at which Cllr L T Dunsdon was elected as the member for the Holbury/North Blackfield Ward be noted.

58. CHANGES TO MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND PANELS.**RESOLVED:**

- (a) That Cllr Dunsdon be appointed to the vacancy on the Planning Development Control Committee; and
- (b) That Cllr Weeks be appointed in place of Cllr Mrs Smith on the NFDC/TVBC Commercial Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

59. THE 2004/2005 COUNCIL TAX (REPORT C).**RESOLVED:**

That it be noted that at its meeting on 26 January 2004 the Council calculated the following amounts for the year 2004/05 in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992: -

- (a) 70,293.80 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	915.70
BEAULIEU	502.60
BOLDRE	1,035.50
BRAMSHAW	343.60
BRANSGORE	1,847.80
BREAMORE	180.70
BROCKENHURST	1,748.10
BURLEY	765.40
COPYTHORNE	1,207.80
DAMERHAM	239.30
DENNY LODGE	149.00
EAST BOLDRE	387.90
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	590.90
EXBURY & LEPE	107.10
FAWLEY	4,788.10
FORDINGBRIDGE	2,285.40
GODSHILL	213.70
HALE	270.90
HORDLE	2,374.90
HYDE	497.20
HYPHE & DIBDEN	7,586.10
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	6,694.00
LYNDHURST	1,379.80
MARCHWOOD	1,983.20
MARTIN	190.00

MILFORD-ON-SEA	2,640.90
MINSTEAD	364.70
NETLEY MARSH	814.10
NEW MILTON	10,615.70
RINGWOOD	5,294.30
ROCKBOURNE	162.40
SANDLEHEATH	265.50
SOPLEY	294.70
SWAY	1,631.70
TOTTON & ELING	9,570.70
WHITSBURY	98.50
WOODGREEN	255.90
	<u>70,293.80</u>

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.

10.2 That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2004/05 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992: -

- (a) £97,041,998 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.
- (b) £74,958,520 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.
- (c) £22,083,478 being the amount by which the aggregate at 10.2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 10.2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
- (d) £9,455,130 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).

- (e) £179.65 being the amount at 10.2(c) above less the amount at 10.2(d) above, all divided by the amount at 10.1(a) 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.
- (f) £3,424,348 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
- (g) £130.94 being the amount at 10.2(e) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 10.2(f) above by the amount at 10.1(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.

(h)

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA

	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	151.69
BEAULIEU	138.90
BOLDRE	147.02
BRAMSHAW	146.95
BRANSGORE	172.45
BREAMORE	153.08
BROCKENHURST	155.25
BURLEY	138.13
COPYTHORNE	138.14
DAMERHAM	148.70
DENNY LODGE	144.36
EAST BOLDRE	141.25
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	147.78
EXBURY & LEPE	137.48
FAWLEY	212.31
FORDINGBRIDGE	191.07
GODSHILL	164.87
HALE	153.09
HORDLE	154.44
HYDE	142.50
HYPHE & DIBDEN	182.98
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	184.12
LYNDHURST	144.35
MARCHWOOD	219.47
MARTIN	149.36
MILFORD-ON-SEA	156.17
MINSTEAD	147.39
NETLEY MARSH	140.01
NEW MILTON	169.39

RINGWOOD	177.36
ROCKBOURNE	152.49
SANDLEHEATH	146.01
SOPLEY	158.09
SWAY	157.29
TOTTON & ELING	222.16
WHITSBURY	145.15
WOODGREEN	145.79

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 10.2(g) 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 10.1(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.

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

These are the District plus Town/Parish Council elements only. See below and page 8 for the full amounts of Council Tax.

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	101.13	117.98	134.83	151.69	185.40	219.11	252.82	303.38
BEAULIEU	92.60	108.03	123.47	138.90	169.76	200.63	231.50	277.80
BOLDRE	98.01	114.35	130.68	147.02	179.69	212.36	245.03	294.04
BRAMSHAW	97.96	114.29	130.62	146.95	179.60	212.26	244.91	293.89
BRANSGORE	114.97	134.13	153.29	172.45	210.77	249.10	287.42	344.90
BREAMORE	102.05	119.06	136.07	153.08	187.09	221.11	255.13	306.15
BROCKENHURST	103.50	120.75	138.00	155.25	189.75	224.25	258.75	310.50
BURLEY	92.08	107.43	122.78	138.13	168.82	199.52	230.21	276.25
COPYTHORNE	92.10	107.44	122.79	138.14	168.84	199.54	230.24	276.29
DAMERHAM	99.13	115.66	132.18	148.70	181.74	214.79	247.83	297.40
DENNY LODGE	96.24	112.28	128.32	144.36	176.44	208.52	240.60	288.73
EAST BOLDRE	94.17	109.86	125.56	141.25	172.64	204.03	235.42	282.50
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	98.52	114.94	131.36	147.78	180.62	213.46	246.30	295.56
EXBURY & LEPE	91.65	106.93	122.20	137.48	168.03	198.58	229.13	274.95
FAWLEY	141.54	165.13	188.72	212.31	259.49	306.66	353.84	424.61
FORDINGBRIDGE	127.38	148.61	169.84	191.07	233.53	275.99	318.45	382.14
GODSHILL	109.91	128.23	146.55	164.87	201.50	238.14	274.78	329.73
HALE	102.06	119.07	136.08	153.09	187.11	221.13	255.15	306.18
HORDLE	102.96	120.12	137.28	154.44	188.77	223.09	257.41	308.89
HYDE	95.00	110.84	126.67	142.50	174.17	205.84	237.51	285.01
HYPHE & DIBDEN	121.99	142.32	162.65	182.98	223.65	264.31	304.97	365.97
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	122.75	143.21	163.66	184.12	225.04	265.95	306.87	368.24
LYNDHURST	96.23	112.27	128.31	144.35	176.43	208.50	240.58	288.70
MARCHWOOD	146.31	170.70	195.08	219.47	268.24	317.01	365.78	438.94

MARCHWOOD	146.31	170.70	195.08	219.47	268.24	317.01	365.78	438.94
MARTIN	99.57	116.17	132.77	149.36	182.55	215.74	248.94	298.72
MILFORD-ON-SEA	104.12	121.47	138.82	156.17	190.88	225.58	260.29	312.35
MINSTEAD	98.26	114.64	131.02	147.39	180.15	212.90	245.65	294.78
NETLEY MARSH	93.34	108.90	124.46	140.01	171.13	202.24	233.35	280.03
NEW MILTON	112.93	131.75	150.57	169.39	207.03	244.67	282.32	338.78
RINGWOOD	118.24	137.95	157.65	177.36	216.78	256.19	295.60	354.72
ROCKBOURNE	101.66	118.60	135.55	152.49	186.38	220.27	254.15	304.98
SANDLEHEATH	97.34	113.56	129.78	146.01	178.45	210.90	243.34	292.01
SOPLEY	105.39	122.96	140.52	158.09	193.22	228.35	263.48	316.17
SWAY	104.86	122.34	139.82	157.29	192.25	227.20	262.15	314.59
TOTTON & ELING	148.11	172.79	197.47	222.16	271.53	320.89	370.26	444.32
WHITSBURY	96.77	112.90	129.03	145.15	177.41	209.67	241.92	290.31
WOODGREEN	97.19	113.39	129.59	145.79	178.19	210.58	242.98	291.58

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 10.2(g) and 10.2(h) 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.

- 10.3 That it be noted that for the year 2004/05 the Hampshire County Council, the Hampshire Police Authority and the Hampshire Fire and Rescue 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	560.10	653.45	746.80	840.15	1,026.85	1,213.55	1,400.25	1,680.30
HAMPSHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY	72.24	84.28	96.32	108.36	132.44	156.52	180.60	216.72
HAMPSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY	34.20	39.90	45.60	51.30	62.70	74.10	85.50	102.60
	666.54	777.63	888.72	999.81	1,221.99	1,444.17	1,666.35	1,999.62

- 10.4 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 10.2(i) and 10.3 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 2004/05 for each of the categories of dwellings shown on the next page: -

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	767.67	895.61	1,023.55	1,151.50	1,407.39	1,663.28	1,919.17	2,303.00
BEAULIEU	759.14	885.66	1,012.19	1,138.71	1,391.75	1,644.80	1,897.85	2,277.42
BOLDRE	764.55	891.98	1,019.40	1,146.83	1,401.68	1,656.53	1,911.38	2,293.66
BRAMSHAW	764.50	891.92	1,019.34	1,146.76	1,401.59	1,656.43	1,911.26	2,293.51
BRANSGORE	781.51	911.76	1,042.01	1,172.26	1,432.76	1,693.27	1,953.77	2,344.52
BREAMORE	768.59	896.69	1,024.79	1,152.89	1,409.08	1,665.28	1,921.48	2,305.77
BROCKENHURST	770.04	898.38	1,026.72	1,155.06	1,411.74	1,668.42	1,925.10	2,310.12
BURLEY	758.62	885.06	1,011.50	1,137.94	1,390.81	1,643.69	1,896.56	2,275.87
COPYTHORNE	758.64	885.07	1,011.51	1,137.95	1,390.83	1,643.71	1,896.59	2,275.91
DAMERHAM	765.67	893.29	1,020.90	1,148.51	1,403.73	1,658.96	1,914.18	2,297.02
DENNY LODGE	762.78	889.91	1,017.04	1,144.17	1,398.43	1,652.69	1,906.95	2,288.35
EAST BOLDRE	760.71	887.49	1,014.28	1,141.06	1,394.63	1,648.20	1,901.77	2,282.12
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	765.06	892.57	1,020.08	1,147.59	1,402.61	1,657.63	1,912.65	2,295.18
EXBURY & LEPE	758.19	884.56	1,010.92	1,137.29	1,390.02	1,642.75	1,895.48	2,274.57
FAWLEY	808.08	942.76	1,077.44	1,212.12	1,481.48	1,750.83	2,020.19	2,424.23
FORDINGBRIDGE	793.92	926.24	1,058.56	1,190.88	1,455.52	1,720.16	1,984.80	2,381.76
GODSHILL	776.45	905.86	1,035.27	1,164.68	1,423.49	1,682.31	1,941.13	2,329.35
HALE	768.60	896.70	1,024.80	1,152.90	1,409.10	1,665.30	1,921.50	2,305.80
HORDLE	769.50	897.75	1,026.00	1,154.25	1,410.76	1,667.26	1,923.76	2,308.51
HYDE	761.54	888.47	1,015.39	1,142.31	1,396.16	1,650.01	1,903.86	2,284.63
HYTHE & DIBDEN	788.54	919.95	1,050.37	1,182.79	1,445.64	1,708.48	1,971.32	2,366.59
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	789.29	920.84	1,052.38	1,183.93	1,447.03	1,710.12	1,973.22	2,367.86
LYNDHURST	762.77	889.90	1,017.03	1,144.16	1,398.42	1,652.67	1,906.93	2,288.32
MARCHWOOD	812.85	948.33	1,083.80	1,219.28	1,490.23	1,761.18	2,032.13	2,438.56
MARTIN	766.11	893.80	1,021.49	1,149.17	1,404.54	1,659.91	1,915.29	2,298.34
MILFORD-ON-SEA	770.66	899.10	1,027.54	1,155.98	1,412.87	1,669.75	1,926.64	2,311.97
MINSTEAD	764.80	892.27	1,019.74	1,147.20	1,402.14	1,657.07	1,912.00	2,294.40
NETLEY MARSH	759.88	886.53	1,013.18	1,139.82	1,393.12	1,646.41	1,899.70	2,279.65
NEW MILTON	779.47	909.38	1,039.29	1,169.20	1,429.02	1,688.84	1,948.67	2,338.40
RINGWOOD	784.78	915.58	1,046.37	1,177.17	1,438.77	1,700.36	1,961.95	2,354.34
ROCKBOURNE	768.20	896.23	1,024.27	1,152.30	1,408.37	1,664.44	1,920.50	2,304.60
SANDLEHEATH	763.88	891.19	1,018.50	1,145.82	1,400.44	1,655.07	1,909.69	2,291.63
SOPLEY	771.93	900.59	1,029.24	1,157.90	1,415.21	1,672.52	1,929.83	2,315.79
SWAY	771.40	899.97	1,028.54	1,157.10	1,414.24	1,671.37	1,928.50	2,314.21
TOTTON & ELING	814.65	950.42	1,086.19	1,221.97	1,493.52	1,765.06	2,036.61	2,443.94
WHITSBURY	763.31	890.53	1,017.75	1,144.96	1,399.40	1,653.84	1,908.27	2,289.93
WOODGREEN	763.73	891.02	1,018.31	1,145.60	1,400.18	1,654.75	1,909.33	2,291.20

CHAIRMAN

- Attachments:**
- Minute No. 54 - Appendix 1
 - Minute No. 54 - Appendix 2
 - Minute No. 54 - Appendix 3
 - Minute No. 54 - Appendix 4

(DEMOCRAT/CL250204/MINUTES.DOC)

Not checked against delivery

BUDGET STATEMENT

From the Leader of New Forest District Council, Cllr Melville Kendal

2004/05 COUNCIL TAX AND EXPENDITURE PROPOSALS

The financial background to this year's New Forest District Council budget is much the same as it was last year except that the political climate surrounding council tax has changed dramatically. Since then, the Audit Commission has reported in two important ways for this Council. Firstly, in December came the Audit Commission's national report that government underfunding was the primary cause of Council Tax increases at such a steep rate last year. In particular, the Audit Commission made the point that those Councils which had received minimal government funding increases were forced by government regulation to spend more money on services than the increases in government grant could accommodate. This resulted in the smaller portion of a Council's income, namely its Council Tax income, having to increase disproportionately. The second important thing that happened was that in January of this year, the Audit Commission reported on its first wave of District Council comprehensive performance assessment results. We received one of the highest ratings and we were thus labelled an 'excellent and improving District Council'. We shall be discussing this item later on our agenda but it is worth making the point that also by January it became clear to us that we had received the lowest government grant increase of all councils in England for 2004/05.

Hearing that there could be another bout of Council Tax increases as there were last year, the government has made emergency funding available to many Unitary, Metropolitan and County Councils. As a District Council the small additional funding we received was more than cancelled out in the next few weeks by the reduction in the amount we receive to administer Council Tax benefits and housing benefits. The effect of these reductions was to reduce our grant increase to approximately £50,000 which is a dot or two less than half of one percent of last year's government grant of £10,058,000. At the same time as this panic funding occurred, the government warned Councils that they would cap any increase not in the low single figures. We did not receive such a letter but we understand that many councils did. It is important to realise why this is occurring. Over the last 7 years the government has increased overall taxation by about 50% but has chosen not to raise this through the traditional route of income tax but through indirect taxation and Council Tax. Councils have been instructed to increase spending at about 3 times the rate of inflation but this has not been matched with corresponding grant increases, leaving the Council Tax payer to pick up the bill. The Chancellor's pre-budget report, which was written prior to the panic funding increases, indicated that he expected to increase Council Tax take from the public by about 8%. Indeed his spending plans are predicated upon getting 8% from Council Tax income from the tax payers of England. This is completely at odds with subsequent ministerial statements that Council Tax will be capped at low single figures which has since been confirmed to mean 5%. The government has introduced highly inflationary new legislation, targets, controls, regulations, work force reforms, along with increased taxation on local councils through National Insurance, landfill tax and pensions tax. Public sector inflation has now reached damaging levels. The Office of the National Statistics figures puts public sector inflation at 1.7% in 1997 and 8.7% in 2003. Much of this is due to new government measures enacted with little idea of consequential costs such as rising pay and pensions, such as the burden of new bureaucracy, such as regulation and control, such as new work force reforms and a climate that has created new risk and litigation. These public sector inflation pressures are extremely complex and they are slow to build up, but

let me assure you that they will be almost impossible to slow down. Coupled with this has been an increase in grant for Councils to the north of us at the expense of Councils here in the south. We are also facing the situation where the average cost of policing in the New Forest has risen by well over 10% today, compared to last year, despite the fact that we are having a reduction of police manpower in the New Forest. In a recent press statement Nick Rainsford has said that Conservative Councils are now amongst the worst Councils for increasing Council Tax, and that voters should remember this when they come to vote in the local elections being held in some parts of England in June of this year. Now we understand the motivation for the way in which funding has been manipulated - and for a while there he had us thinking it was due to such matters as deprivation statistics in the north of England.

What is clear in all this muddle and confusion is that council taxpayers are suffering and either have reduced services or Council Tax has to increase significantly.

This financial background has forced us to try and achieve savings in order to meet the extra commitments placed upon us by the government. Our officers, as usual, have responded to this particular task admirably. Expenditure Plan savings of over £2m are reflected in the documents which are attached to the budget recommendations for this year. This has enabled us to continue investment in our key corporate areas while allowing for the extra expenditure incurred by the raft of government requirements I mentioned earlier. Indeed, had we received the advertised minimum increase for District Councils, our total expenditure of some £18.6m would have enabled us to keep the Council Tax increase below 2%. As it is, in order to meet salary related increases and public service inflation pressures without the expected increase in government grant, we shall require the Council Taxpayer to pay an extra 4.9% this year. The increase is £6.12 for a Band D Council Taxpayer or about 50p a month, and means that the average Council Taxpayer will still be paying less than £11 a month in Council taxes for the services he receives from us. It is far less than the increase in the Police precept or the Fire Authority precept and lower than many Parish Council increases.

Insofar as our capital programme is concerned, we have strengthened our reserves by becoming debt free and we remain committed to the projects in the centre of Totton, in Hythe on the promenade, in Marchwood, Lymington, and the coastal works at Barton-on-Sea, Milford-on-Sea and Lymington. We shall also press ahead with replacement of those public lavatories which need to be replaced and there is no change in the programme already announced.

In common with a few other Councils we did have a look at the effect of Council Tax on retired pensioners. In the end our efforts lacked any support from the government and the only way we could have given a further discount to the 32% of retired Council Taxpayers in the New Forest, would have been at the expense of the remaining 68%. Furthermore, the District Council Tax would have had to pick up any shortfall in all the other Council Taxes for the other authorities, such as County, Police and Fire Authority. This clearly was not sustainable. Nevertheless, it has become apparent that many of our Council Taxpayers in this bracket are not obtaining the full Council Tax benefit which is applicable to them as retired pensioners. The rules are complex and the very title suggests that this is some kind of Social Security benefit. It is not. It is an allowance in the same way as the basic personal allowance operates or the capital gains tax allowance operates for ordinary taxpayers. It is an allowance which should, therefore, be claimed by every single pensioner entitled to it. I have asked our Finance Department to provide simple examples and a leaflet, and to highlight in a deliberate campaign the obvious allowances which some Council Taxpayers are foregoing for misplaced reasons of pride. The same Council Taxpayer who obtains his personal allowance and his capital gains tax allowance

and his age allowance should also be obtaining his Council Tax benefit allowance but it is readily apparent that that is not happening. As District Councillors I would ask you to publicise this aspect through the Parish Councils when you meet and with the Residents Association and other voluntary bodies wherever possible. In this respect, the CAB have been particularly helpful and deserve to be commended for their work in this area, as also do Age Concern. Age Concern have asked me to highlight this issue and I do so gladly today.

We are not the only organisations that suffer from every increasing government regulation and costs. This additional burden has forced many small shop keepers and traders to cease operating in our villages and has affected the Post Office and Sub-Post Office structure in these villages as well. More and more the village pub or village post office or newsagent is a thing of the past and the village hall, old and rickety as it may be, has assumed greater and greater significance as a meeting place for what is now termed 'social cohesion' in modern speak. Many of you who represent rural parishes or small semi-urban parishes outside of the major towns will know the financial constraints within which so many voluntary organisations in these villages are attempting to do what is an excellent job. Lack of public transport to the main centres means that their entertainment, their social activities, for both young and old, are centred more and more upon their community centre or village hall. Town Councils with their larger tax base have worked well with us in partnership in areas such as Ringwood, New Milton, Lymington, Totton, and Hythe and Dibden. Because these are our main population areas, many of the voluntary organisations are well funded in these areas, compared to the small Rural and Parish Councils. Similarly, the Town Councils themselves run many programmes to assist community activities, and of course, the District Council has its major recreation centres in each of these areas. None of these advantages apply to the local Parish Council in say Bramshaw, Bransgore or Burley, or even Parishes such as Marchwood or Ashurst.

I propose that we increase the grants budget to allow for a specific rural access assistance under the control of individual District Councillors in those Wards which are not also Wards of the 5 towns in the Forest.

District Councillors who represent a Ward which is either Lymington (and Pennington), Ringwood, New Milton, Totton, or Hythe and Dibden, would not be involved in the rural access assistance initiative for the reasons I mentioned earlier.

Furthermore, frequently the amounts involved, while important to the recipients and the community, are relatively trivial - too trivial for the District Council to get involved in the paperwork generated in order to approve such a grant and to provide the necessary audit trail. Chairs for example may be needed to complete furniture in say Calshot Village Hall but the amount of paperwork generated to provide such a worthwhile benefit is out of all proportion to the cost of administration by the District Council.

Therefore, provided that the amount sought meets any one of the objectives in the "Heart of the Forest" and provided there is a satisfactory audit trail, I propose that the District Councillors will be given the authority, after agreement with the Parish Council Chairman or his designated member, to agree to the expenditure of such amounts without further reference to the District Council. The cumulative cost of grants over the financial year should not exceed £500 per District Councillor.

As the rural access assistance initiative is to be a pilot programme, we will take a progress report back to the appropriate panel around November 2004 with the comments of the participating Councillors. As it is a pilot programme, I do not think it is necessary for us to allow

for this in the base Revenue Budget. If funding is to continue then it would need to form part of a bid for future years. The bid would need to be examined in the light of the experience of the Councillors in the pilot project. Amounts not spent or allocated by 31st March 2005 may not be carried forward to the next budget year.

In total this makes some 26 District Councillors representing Wards which are not part of one of the 5 towns. This proposal would increase the grants budget from £139710 to £152710- an increase of £13000.

Councillors may wish to "pool" their monies in a joint community venture eg an Arts festival which is cross-boundary and this would be permitted with advice from the participants as to how much of their allowance is to be debited.

I therefore propose an amendment to our existing recommendations which will allow for this rural access assistance proposal so that an extra amount of £13,000 may be included in our overall expenditure programme under 'grants'. I am confident that we will be able to fund it from savings and, therefore, it does not need to affect the Council Tax for this particular year. The fact that we are an excellent Council will mean that the Audit Commission will require us to do less work next year and, therefore, they in turn will do less work, and charge us less. We don't know exactly what the saving is but it could be as much as £30,000 and, therefore, it would certainly cover this additional grant money which I am sure you will all agree is a worthwhile initiative.

We have allowed this year for additional revenue from our traffic management proposals which will in turn help fund the travel token costs of over £700,000. Some of this will also be needed for further studies and work associated with the decriminalisation programme upon which we are embarking with the County Council. We cannot be sure of the exact extra income that this will provide but we do know that our current car parking deficit will emerge as a surplus and we expect the net effect to be of the order of some £650,000 per annum which clearly has had a major influence in assisting us to keep the Council Tax increase this year down to 4.9%.

I would like to thank Colin Wise and the officers, and all the Panels, who have spent many hours producing such an outturn for the Council Taxpayer. No major services have had to be cut. No front line services have been affected, and we have achieved a lower average Council Tax increase than applies elsewhere. The average Council Tax increase for New Forest District Council over the last 6 years is a little over 4% per annum. This is due to the efforts of everyone in this room and I thank you all for your assistance.

The amended recommendations are, therefore, placed before you, and as shown on the separate sheets and I commend them to you.

END

Liberal Democrat Alternative Budget 2004

Our excellence under the Comprehensive Performance Assessment is rightly to be celebrated. Our officers deserve all the praise that the Audit Commission and we and other local politicians have given. However it makes our job all the more difficult because now we've got to work hard to stay at the top. Hopefully there will be some savings in terms of Audit fees and some bureaucracy but so far we've heard nothing of the freedoms and flexibilities we were promised.

No surprise there then.

Of course another big issue has been this years' the government settlement. It's a shame it wasn't as good as it had been spun, but nevertheless it was another increase in grant to add to the year on year total government grant increases since 1999/2000.

Meanwhile, the Council Tax has become increasingly unpopular with the public. This Council has supported the view that change is needed, although we disagree politically on the solution.

The Axe the Tax campaign is growing and I am encouraged by the recent announcement that the government is considering different options for change, including one that is a hybrid local tax that would incorporate both a property and an element based on income. We'll have to wait for the promised review of local authority funding in the summer to know what the Deputy Prime Minister is going to propose, but until then we must deliver services which are within our means without too much of an increased tax burden on the public.

The Liberal Democrat Group believes that NFDC could do more to keep residents tax increases down for the forthcoming year. We have aimed to achieve a figure that keeps the increase as close to inflation as possible. This is what we have sought to do without any further effect on front line services.

One of the more difficult tasks for the Administration is keeping the budget under control. I have already placed on record my concerns about the slippage on capital expenditure and I am pleased to see that this has been taken seriously. Nevertheless we will continue to keep a close eye on progress.

But there is also is a lot of work to be done on the revenue budgets. There are always unexpected items of expenditure that arise during the year, but the last financial report to Cabinet showed a total of £541k of supplementary estimates for the current financial year. This is far too high. If this expenditure had been allowed for in last years budget, the tax increase would have been 9.96% rather than the 3.5% you actually achieved.

Luckily we are likely to see a substantial underspend that will probably cancel out the increased expenditure and this will save your bacon.

On the other hand, if it weren't for those supplementary estimates you would have ended up over-taxing the residents.....now where have I heard that accusation before?

Basically this is not good business and must be tightened up.

Currently, this Council spends around £2 million a year on IT and because of the increasing demands for new technology; this figure is likely to rise. Whilst we support the modernisation of working practices and improvements in information access and

communications that ICT investment brings, the Liberal Democrat Group believes we need to be more aware of services efficiencies and benefits of investment before committing to ongoing spend.

We would like to see more discipline introduced into the system that will mean that business efficiencies are identified before more ICT investment is authorised. That way we will know and be able to monitor the efficiencies and improvements that the investment will bring.

Which brings me to traffic management, or car-parking charges as it is more commonly known.

If it weren't for the anticipated income resulting from the reintroduction of parking charges, this year's tax would be 7.41% higher. We, and the public are very glad that the income will be available to spare us that. It's fascinating really considering that only 4 years ago the newly elected Tory Administration rejected parking charges, assuring us all they didn't need income from parking!

In fact, only a few weeks ago at a Council meeting, you told us:

"any surplus would be used to fund decriminalisation arrangements and the management of On Street car parking."

You said:

"The charge for the parking clock would help to cover the cost of introducing the new traffic management regulations for On Street car parking **and car parks...**"

Of course those last 3 words allow you to claim that that's where the surplus is going this year, and probably some to cover the historical cost of other existing transport related expenditure like concessionary fares, but actually you promised us all new initiatives. There's nothing in next year's budget to enable the development of On street parking deregulation or any other new traffic management initiatives are there?

So those are our challenges to you.

Now I expect you'd like to hear how we are going to save money on the council tax aren't you? It's quite simple really.

Our Proposals

Public Relations

In 1998/99 the cost of Public Relations for NFDC was £116,336.

By 2002/03 this had risen to £163,610 and then another £10k was slipped in for 2003/04 by way of a supplementary estimate!

Now you are asking the taxpayer for an extra £27,000!

£15,000 is for a stand at the New Forest Show....is this really an essential item of expenditure, a nice thing to do, or an attempt to 'keep up with the Jones' because HCC is going to be there?

The rest is apparently needed for more staff to write press releases etc.

Together with inflation and other minor adjustments, this will bring the 04/05 budget up to £197,700!

We believe that in the current circumstances a stand at the New Forest Show and more writing staff, are a luxury.

It seems that this part of NFDC is an area that can grow unchecked at a time when front line services are coming under increasing pressure to make savings. How can that be?

We can save £27,000 without any impact on services to the public here and we calculate will save 0.30% tax increase.

Revenue to Capital

The budget has almost a quarter of a million pounds from the taxpayer being put into savings. Why?

The capital reserves for the next few years are pretty healthy and likely to grow considerably next year because we will have around £5million freed up and when we become 'debt free' and in excess of £2million available from the commutation reserve.

The only reason we legitimately need to put money from Council Tax income into capital is the extra money we will be getting from the discount reduction on second homes that will be spent on housing. It is expected that this will amount to just under £100k.

By reducing the amount of revenue to capital by £144,000 we can save another 1.65%.

Commercial Services

It seems the new organisation formed by merging with Test Valley to provide Commercial Services in the two districts is generally going well....unless you live near the Claymeadow Depot of course, where the residents may have a different view. The return to this Council that is currently required for next year is £112,000.

We believe the partnership should be given more challenging targets now that it has had time to establish itself and so would set a higher target of £150,000. This is achievable and represents another 0.43% saving.

This is a total saving of 2.38% on the published figures and would mean a tax increase for NFDC services of 2.52% or £3.15 on a Band D property instead of the £6.12 you agreed in Cabinet.

In summary then, being an excellent authority means that we should be prepared to accept challenge and to critically examine our own performance. This puts extra pressure on the Administration not to settle for defending itself but to own up to areas of weakness. Getting the housekeeping right would be a good place to start.

Keep your promises, or better still don't make promises you can't keep. Only 4 years ago you assured everyone that you didn't need income from parking charges to keep council tax down, but now you're doing it. Only a few weeks ago you said surpluses from parking charges would be used to develop traffic management improvements. Where are they? Not to be found in your budget.

Residents have had enough of the Council Tax and incessant rises over and above inflation, yet it is clear that this years rises can be better controlled by rejecting bids which don't actually improve front line services, giving greater challenge for services to be more efficient, and avoiding stashing money unnecessarily into the Councils' coffers.

The Liberal Democrats have shown it can be done and we believe the budget should be adjusted accordingly and so propose the amendments detailed above.

Maureen Robinson. 24.2.04.

NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
DRAFT GENERAL FUND FORECAST 2004/05 TO 2007/08 BASED ON 2003/04 BUDGET

<u>15/04/04</u>	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Net Portfolio Requirements	20055	19140	18450	19721	21069
Est. Inflation (salary related)		560	580	600	620
Other Inflation		180	180	190	190
Sub Total (A)	20055	19880	19210	20511	21879
Capital Financing Provision		244	100	100	
Sub Total (B)	20055	20124	19310	20611	21879
Less Interest on Balances(net)	-800	-370			
Sub Total (C)	19255	19754	19310	20611	21879
Transfer From MRP/Reg157	-115	-137	142	110	
Budget Requirements	19140	19617	19452	20721	21879
Add Expenditure Plan Bids					
Corporate & Finance		693	370	390	69
Crime & Disorder		10	-10	0	10
Economy & Planning		272	-40	0	0
Environment		137	172	50	30
Health & Social Inclusion		4	4	0	0
Housing		17	-3	-3	-3
Leisure		726	-70	0	-2
General Purposes & Licensing Committee		35	6	0	0
Planning Development Control Committee		124	0	0	0
Standards Committee		0	0	0	0
Sub Total Bids	0	2019	429	437	105
Deduct Expenditure Plan Savings					
Corporate & Finance		-221	-108	-5	0
Crime & Disorder		0	0	0	0
Economy & Planning		-743	0	-6	0
Environment		-157	44	-15	0
Health & Social Inclusion		0	0	0	0
Housing		-50	-4	-4	-4
Leisure		-562	-200	-59	-1
General Purposes & Licensing Committee		-198	129	0	0
Planning Development Control Committee		-259	0	0	0
Standards Committee		0	0	0	0
Sub Total Savings	0	-2190	-138	-89	-5
Other Items (Approved during 03/4)		271	-22	0	-15
Direct Benefits Grant		-946			
Transfer from Commercial Services		-112			
Forecast Budget Requirements	19140	18659	19721	21069	21964
Total (E)					
New Forest Show Exhibit		-15			
External Writers		-12			
Increase transfer from Commercial Services		-38			
Reduction in Capital Financing Provision		-144			
Transfer to/from(-) Reserves	-72				
Budget Required after Reserve Transfer	19068	18450	19721	21069	21964

FINANCED

Collection Fund /RSG/ NDR	10395	9455	9571	9712	9855
Council Tax	8673	8995	10149	11357	12109
	19068	18450	19721	21069	21964
Council Tax	124.82	127.97	144.11	160.95	171.29
Council Tax Increase		2.52	12.62	11.68	6.42

**NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
OTHER SERVICES CAPITAL EXPENDITURE
SUMMARY AND RESOURCES 2003/04 TO 2007/08**

APPENDIX 4

Date Prepared :-

15-Apr-04

<u>ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE</u>	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	Total
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Corporate & Finance	887	460	228	110	-	1,685
Crime & Disorder	33	-	100	-	-	133
Environment - General	653	326	181	180	5	1,345
Environment - Coast Prot / Land Drainage	1,612	1,095	1,107	9,207	10,928	23,949
Economy & Planning	336	261	-	-	-	597
Leisure - General	1,047	1,409	358	76	20	2,910
Leisure - Developers' Contributions	1,646	642	9	9	-	2,306
TOTALS	6,214	4,193	1,983	9,582	10,953	32,925

PROPOSED FINANCING

BCA (Loan)	153					153
SCA (Coast & Land Drainage)	200	196	176	1,731	2,315	4,618
SCA Commutation	396					396
Minimum Revenue Provision						-
Grants & Other Contributions	1,859	1,226	1,131	7,586	8,613	20,415
Developers' Contributions	1,665	642	9	9	-	2,325
Revenue Provision (Gen. Fund.)	-	9	109	209	209	536
Usable Capital Receipts		200				200
Advance Grant re Coast P and Land D	-416					-416
Capital Reserve	2,357	1,920	558	47	184	4,698
TOTALS	6,214	4,193	1,983	9,582	10,953	32,925

ESTIMATED BALANCES

	01/04/03	01/04/04	01/04/05	01/04/06	01/04/07	01/04/08
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
CAPITAL RESERVE	5,778	3,421	1,501	943	896	1,080
DEV. CONTRIBS.	6,591	4,926	4,284	4,275	4,266	4,266

Notes:

1. Subject to agreement with the District Auditor, there will be a further £2.3m available towards capital or revenue expenditure from the Commutation Reserve.
2. Once the Council's debt is repaid, the estimated £5m balance of investments held under the current 'set-aside' rules will become available, subject to specific technical criteria, to meet future capital expenditure or be retained for investment.
3. The optimum use of these resources will be more fully evaluated and reported to Members as part of the future financial strategy for the Council.