

26 FEBRUARY 2007

## NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the New Forest District Council held at Appletree Court, Lyndhurst on Monday, 26 February 2007.

- p Cllr D N Scott - Chairman
- p Cllr W H Dow - Vice-Chairman

### Councillors:

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

### Councillors:

- p G J Parkes
- p Sqn Ldr B M F Pemberton
- p J Penwarden
- p L R Puttock
- p A W Rice TD
- p B Rickman
- p Mrs M J Robinson
- e B Rule
- p D J Russell
- p T M Russell
- p N E Scott
- p Lt Col M J Shand
- p S A Shepherd
- p Mrs B Smith
- p Mrs S I Snowden
- p M H Thierry
- p A R Tinsley
- p D B Tipp
- p C R Treleaven
- p Mrs B Vincent
- e 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
- p P R Woods
- p Mrs P A Wyeth

### Officers Attending:

D Yates, C Malyon, J Mascall, K Green, Ms G O'Rourke, A Rogers and Mrs R Rutins.

### 54. MINUTES (PAPER A).

#### RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2006, having been circulated, be signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to:

- On Minute 51 - Portfolio Holder's Question Time (Question 4 from Cllr Ms Ford to Cllr Beck concerning the repercussions of central government's funding cuts for neighbourhood policing), Cllr Weeks stated that he had raised a point of order concerning a personal explanation he had made which had not been recorded.
- Minute 52(a) – Notice of Motion concerning birth centres in the New Forest, Cllr F R Harrison pointed out that no mention had been made of the view expressed that the Leader's amendment to the motion was a direct negative. It was also pointed out that the substantive motion had not been put. He questioned the validity of the decision in that context.
- On Minute 52(b) – Notice of motion concerning climate change, Cllr Mrs Smith expressed concern about her motion not being referred to Cabinet at the appropriate time. The Chief Executive acknowledged that, whilst the overall issue was being addressed through the Green Audit, the matter should have been referred to the Cabinet in January and he apologised for the omission.

**55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

All members declared an interest in Minute 62 – Report of Standards Committee – Members' Allowances.

Cllrs Mrs Robinson, Dunsdon, Thierry and Kendal declared interests in Minute 59.

**56. BY-ELECTION FOR DISTRICT COUNCIL BARTON WARD –  
25 JANUARY 2007 – REPORT OF THE RETURNING OFFICER  
(REPORT B).**

The Chairman welcomed Cllr Mrs Carpenter to her first meeting of the Council following her election on 25 January 2007.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report of the Returning Officer on the by-election for the District Council's Barton Ward be noted.

**57. FAILURE OF COUNCIL E-MAIL SYSTEM.**

The Chief Executive explained the reasons for the recent major failure of the Council's e-mail system and apologised to councillors and the public for the inconvenience this had caused. Officers were working hard to minimise any disruption to services.

**58. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.****Planthunters' Fair – 2007**

The Chairman explained that because of the forthcoming local elections, the date of the annual Planthunters' Fair had been changed from 5 to 12 May. The Planthunters' Fair was for everyone, absolute beginners and garden experts alike, with many of the South's best nurseries and garden suppliers all in one place. He asked for volunteers to help with the event on the day. Volunteer helpers would be able to enter the event for free. Proceeds would go to the Chairman's charity.

**Charities' Banquet and Ball 2007**

The Chairman regretfully informed members that it was not possible to fit in the Chairman's Banquet and Ball this year traditionally held in aid of the Chairman's charities. He explained that, as he was not having to buy tickets or meet other expenses for this event, he was donating £200 to his charities. He would be writing to members and others seeking their donations to these worthwhile charities.

**Council Calling All Veterans**

The Chairman announced that the Council was drawing up plans to support the National Veterans' Celebrations. The big day nationally was on Wednesday, 27 June 2007, but the Council would be running a series of events in the build-up to that date from 17 to 23 June.

The Council was keen to hear from service and ex-service groups and individuals, including civilians, who had been involved in all conflicts, including the World Wars, the Gulf War, the Falklands campaign and all recent and current conflicts such as Iraq and Afghanistan. Veterans' groups and individuals were being asked to indicate their interest in the events by contacting the Council's Communications Unit. The Chairman asked members to bring these events to the attention of any veterans or their families with whom they came into contact, and encouraged them to take part in the local celebrations.

**Parish Play Areas and Play Schemes for the New Forest**

The Chairman was pleased to announce that almost £300,000 of National Lottery Funding was heading for parish play areas and play schemes in the New Forest. A bid led by this Council and overseen by a multi-agency project board had resulted in an award of £294,680 by the Big Lottery Fund. The money would go to 5 different schemes across the New Forest that involved partnerships with the Parish Councils of Hythe and Dibden, Bransgore, New Milton, Totton and Eling, as well as the Thorney Hill Community Association. Integral to the success of the bid was New Forest District Council's Play Officer, Dye Lockyer. The Chairman wished to take the opportunity, on behalf of all members of the Council, of thanking her for all her hard work and commitment which had led to such a positive outcome.

**Members of the Council**

Members were pleased to welcome Cllr John Hoy back to Council duties, following a period of illness.

It was noted that Cllr Danny Cracknell was currently undergoing further hospital treatment. Members wished him well.

**59. REPORTS OF CABINET AND COMMITTEES.**

Cllr Mrs Robinson declared a personal interest in Item 6 of the Cabinet report (Blackfield Neighbourhood Centre), as a Board Member of the Spinnaker Housing Group. She did not consider her interests to be prejudicial. There was no discussion on this particular item.

Cllr Dunsdon declared a personal interest in Item 6 of the Cabinet report (Blackfield Neighbourhood Centre) in respect of his involvement with the Centre. He did not consider this interest to be prejudicial. There was no discussion on this particular item.

Cllr Kendal declared a personal interest in Item 11 of the Cabinet report (Project Integra – Revisions to Constitution and Annual Business Plan) as Standing Deputy on the Project Integra Board appointed by Hampshire County Council. He did not consider interest was prejudicial. There was no discussion on this particular item.

Cllr Thierry declared a personal interest in Item 11 of the Cabinet report (Project Integra – Revisions to Constitution and Annual Business Plan) as Chairman of the Project Integra Board appointed by New Forest District Council. He did not consider that his interest was prejudicial. There was no discussion on this item.

Cllr Kendal, Chairman of the Cabinet and Leader of the Council presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 3 January and 7 February 2007.

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

**Item 4 - General Fund Revenue Budget and all Capital Programme 2007/08- 2010/11**

The Chief Executive suggested an amended procedure for dealing with amendments which would avoid duplication in the debate. This was agreed.

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 amendments:-

- (i) That recommendation (a) be amended to read as follows:-

That the General Fund budget for 2007/08 be set at £21.726m;

- (ii) That recommendation (b) be amended to read as follows:-

That the Council Tax be agreed at £143.67 for a Band D property for 2007/08.

The amendment was seconded.

The Leader of the Opposition then made a statement (attached as Appendix 2 to these minutes) and moved amendments giving alternative budget proposals for 2007/08 as set out in Appendix 2.

Cllr Mrs Robinson seconded these amendments and in doing so commented that all members were committed to the lowest possible increase in Council Tax, but that there were differences in how monies were spent and the overall philosophy. She referred to the Administration's initial opposition to the raising of revenue through car parking charges. The administration had re-introduced charging on the premise that these were for traffic management reasons, but she saw very little in the way of traffic management policies. She felt that the Opposition's proposals encouraged sustainability. The Administration had promoted car sharing the previous year, but there appeared to have been little effort to reduce private car journeys since then. She referred to the positive findings of recent surveys mentioned in the Leaders' speech, but she emphasised that the Council must also learn from the negative comments.

Other members discussed the detail of the budget proposals.

Cllr Wise referred to the Opposition's budget proposals and expressed concern that the proposed initial capital cost of kerbside glass collection of £584,000 did not appear to be provided for in their budget summary. He further pointed out that 12 years ago, the District Council took a share of the overall Council Tax was 12.5% - it was now only 8.5%.

A member pointed out that between 1993 and 1999 the Council Tax increase had averaged at 2.8% per year, but in the last 8 years the figure had been 4%.

In commenting on the Opposition's proposals concerning a kerbside glass collection, the Environment Portfolio Holder felt that the proposals were ill thought-out and that details such as the frequency of collections and how the glass would be sorted, had not had sufficient consideration.

In reply, Cllr Weeks felt that, when the budget proposals were discussed some months ago, concern had been raised over a potential £700,000 budget deficit, but this had now not turned out to be the case. He indicated that he would support the lowest Council Tax possible, but that the Opposition's proposals were self-contained and did not affect the proposal to reduce the increase in the District Council share of the Council Tax to 1.9%.

In summing up, the Leader of the Council referred to the Opposition's glass collection proposal and said that this could be referred to the appropriate Review Panel to analyse in detail. He queried some of the figures within the Opposition's proposals and felt that the £291,000 set-up costs for the glass recycling would result in a 3% increase in the Council Tax. He referred to the comparisons in Council Tax rises made by a member and pointed out that accounting methods were different from previous years. He also referred to the pension fund problems which Councils now faced and other additional duties and functions imposed by Government, but without provision of additional funding. He referred to the health concerns raised in respect of sun beds, and he felt this was a matter of choice and he was against over-regulation. He referred to the Councillors' Rural Grant Scheme and indicated that when the imminent Government guidance following the White Paper emerged, members might be surprised about the possible changes to the scheme and individual members may have control over these funds.

Upon a vote, an amendment proposed by the Leader of the Council to reduce the Council Tax increase to 1.9%, including the two amendments necessary to achieve this, was agreed as the substantive motion.

Cllr Weeks concluded by saying that this Council was falling behind other Councils in not undertaking glass collections. He felt that collections would reduce the number of overall journeys to glass recycling points. He explained that the implications of the capital expenditure had been allowed for within the revenue budget costings and the proposals had been formulated on the basis of advice sought from officers. He pointed out that the underspends in budgets could have saved 2% of the Council Tax.

The Leader of the Council, in bringing the debate to an end, reiterated that the Council might consider kerbside glass collections, although the proposals needed adequate funding. He repeated that £291,000 set-up costs for the glass collection scheme were net annual revenue costs which would require 3% extra on Council Tax and presented a worrying ongoing revenue implication.

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

The substantive motion was put and was carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be received and the recommendations be adopted, subject to the amendments of the recommendations on item 4 to read:-

- (i) That recommendation (a) be amended to read as follows:-

That the General Fund Budget for 2007/08 be set at £21.726m

- (ii) That recommendation (b) be amended to read as follows:-

That the Council Tax be agreed at £143.67 for a Band D property for 2007/08.

**60. REPORT OF GENERAL PURPOSES AND LICENSING COMMITTEE.**

Cllr Dow, Chairman of the General Purposes and Licensing Committee, presented the report of the meeting held on 12 January 2007.

On the motion that the report be received and the recommendations be adopted it was:-

**RESOLVED:**

That the report of be received and the recommendations be adopted.

**61. REPORT OF COMMERCIAL SERVICES JOINT COMMITTEE.**

Cllr Thierry, Chairman of the Joint Committee, presented the report of the meeting held on 7 December 2006.

On the motion that the report be received, it was:-

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be received.

**62. REPORT OF STANDARDS COMMITTEE.**

Cllr Hutchins, Vice-Chairman of the Standards Committee, presented the report of the meeting held on 26 January 2007.

On the motion that the report be received and the recommendation be adopted, it was:-

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be received and the recommendation be adopted.

**63. PORTFOLIO HOLDERS' QUESTION TIME.**

There were none.

**64. THE 2007/2008 COUNCIL TAX (REPORT C).**

Arising from the Council's decision under Minute No. 59, revised recommendations were tabled.

**RESOLVED:**

(1) That it be noted that at its meeting on 18 December 2006 the Council calculated the following amounts for the year 2007/08 in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992: -

(a) 71,687.40 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) <b>LOCAL COUNCIL AREA</b>	
ASHURST & COLBURY	920.20
BEAULIEU	516.40
BOLDRE	1,051.40
BRAMSHAW	342.00
BRANSGORE	1,865.10
BREAMORE	184.50
BROCKENHURST	1,793.10
BURLEY	791.10
COPYTHORNE	1,228.10
DAMERHAM	237.30
DENNY LODGE	153.80
EAST BOLDRE	398.80
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	585.70
EXBURY & LEPE	110.10
FAWLEY	4,824.30
FORDINGBRIDGE	2,363.30
GODSHILL	214.20
HALE	266.80
HORDLE	2,437.30
HYDE	506.70
HYPHE & DIBDEN	7,699.20
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	6,898.30
LYNDHURST	1,384.00
MARCHWOOD	2,035.80
MARTIN	191.80
MILFORD-ON-SEA	2,715.20
MINSTEAD	365.90
NETLEY MARSH	821.90
NEW MILTON	10,808.40



RINGWOOD	5,408.00
ROCKBOURNE	166.50
SANDLEHEATH	271.30
SOPLEY	304.90
SWAY	1,665.90
TOTTON & ELING	9,805.50
WHITSBURY	102.80
WOODGREEN	251.80
	71,687.40

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.

- (2) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2007/08 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992: -
- (a) £100,985,330 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) £75,178,870 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) £25,806,460 being the amount by which the aggregate at (2)(a) above exceeds the aggregate at (2)(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
- (d) £11,426,710 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) £200.59 being the amount at (2)(c) above less the amount at (2)(d) above, all divided by the amount at (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) £4,080,420 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
- (g) £143.67 being the amount at (2)(e) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (2)(f) above by the amount at (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	162.85
BEAULIEU	154.32
BOLDRE	160.39
BRAMSHAW	155.37
BRANSGORE	195.39
BREAMORE	165.35
BROCKENHURST	168.55
BURLEY	157.57
COPYTHORNE	151.81
DAMERHAM	162.63
DENNY LODGE	159.92
EAST BOLDRE	159.34
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	163.30
EXBURY & LEPE	148.21
FAWLEY	231.07
FORDINGBRIDGE	208.29
GODSHILL	183.35
HALE	171.33
HORDLE	176.99
HYDE	157.48
HYPHE & DIBDEN	209.17
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	211.66
LYNDHURST	170.73
MARCHWOOD	236.00
MARTIN	164.53
MILFORD-ON-SEA	171.21
MINSTEAD	164.17
NETLEY MARSH	153.40
NEW MILTON	189.18
RINGWOOD	202.99
ROCKBOURNE	164.69
SANDLEHEATH	159.34
SOPLEY	185.68
SWAY	161.08
TOTTON & ELING	246.03
WHITSBURY	160.40
WOODGREEN	164.72

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at (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 (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 12 for the full amounts of Council Tax.

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	108.57	126.66	144.76	162.85	199.04	235.23	271.42	325.70
BEAULIEU	102.88	120.03	137.17	154.32	188.61	222.91	257.20	308.64
BOLDRE	106.93	124.75	142.57	160.39	196.03	231.67	267.32	320.78
BRAMSHAW	103.58	120.84	138.11	155.37	189.90	224.42	258.95	310.74
BRANSGORE	130.26	151.97	173.68	195.39	238.81	282.23	325.65	390.78
BREAMORE	110.23	128.61	146.98	165.35	202.09	238.84	275.58	330.70
BROCKENHURST	112.37	131.09	149.82	168.55	206.01	243.46	280.92	337.10
BURLEY	105.05	122.55	140.06	157.57	192.59	227.60	262.62	315.14
COPYTHORNE	101.21	118.07	134.94	151.81	185.55	219.28	253.02	303.62
DAMERHAM	108.42	126.49	144.56	162.63	198.77	234.91	271.05	325.26
DENNY LODGE	106.61	124.38	142.15	159.92	195.46	231.00	266.53	319.84
EAST BOLDRE	106.23	123.93	141.64	159.34	194.75	230.16	265.57	318.68
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	108.87	127.01	145.16	163.30	199.59	235.88	272.17	326.60
EXBURY & LEPE	98.81	115.27	131.74	148.21	181.15	214.08	247.02	296.42
FAWLEY	154.05	179.72	205.40	231.07	282.42	333.77	385.12	462.14
FORDINGBRIDGE	138.86	162.00	185.15	208.29	254.58	300.86	347.15	416.58
GODSHILL	122.23	142.61	162.98	183.35	224.09	264.84	305.58	366.70
HALE	114.22	133.26	152.29	171.33	209.40	247.48	285.55	342.66
HORDLE	117.99	137.66	157.32	176.99	216.32	255.65	294.98	353.98
HYDE	104.99	122.48	139.98	157.48	192.48	227.47	262.47	314.96
HYTHE & DIBDEN	139.45	162.69	185.93	209.17	255.65	302.13	348.62	418.34
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	141.11	164.62	188.14	211.66	258.70	305.73	352.77	423.32
LYNDHURST	113.82	132.79	151.76	170.73	208.67	246.61	284.55	341.46
MARCHWOOD	157.33	183.56	209.78	236.00	288.44	340.89	393.33	472.00
MARTIN	109.69	127.97	146.25	164.53	201.09	237.65	274.22	329.06
MILFORD-ON-SEA	114.14	133.16	152.19	171.21	209.26	247.30	285.35	342.42
MINSTEAD	109.45	127.69	145.93	164.17	200.65	237.13	273.62	328.34
NETLEY MARSH	102.27	119.31	136.36	153.40	187.49	221.58	255.67	306.80

NEW MILTON	126.12	147.14	168.16	189.18	231.22	273.26	315.30	378.36
RINGWOOD	135.33	157.88	180.44	202.99	248.10	293.21	338.32	405.98
ROCKBOURNE	109.79	128.09	146.39	164.69	201.29	237.89	274.48	329.38
SANDLEHEATH	106.23	123.93	141.64	159.34	194.75	230.16	265.57	318.68
SOPLEY	123.79	144.42	165.05	185.68	226.94	268.20	309.47	371.36
SWAY	107.39	125.28	143.18	161.08	196.88	232.67	268.47	322.16
TOTTON & ELING	164.02	191.36	218.69	246.03	300.70	355.38	410.05	492.06
WHITSBURY	106.93	124.76	142.58	160.40	196.04	231.69	267.33	320.80
WOODGREEN	109.81	128.12	146.42	164.72	201.32	237.93	274.53	329.44

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (2)(g) and (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.

- (3) That it be noted that for the year 2007/08 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	637.08	743.26	849.44	955.62	1,167.98	1,380.34	1,592.70	1,911.24
HAMPSHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY	83.58	97.51	111.44	125.37	153.23	181.09	208.95	250.74
HAMPSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY	37.38	43.61	49.84	56.07	68.53	80.99	93.45	112.14
	758.04	884.38	1,010.72	1,137.06	1,389.74	1,642.42	1,895.10	2,274.12

- (4) That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (2)(i) and (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 2007/08 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	866.61	1,011.04	1,155.48	1,299.91	1,588.78	1,877.65	2,166.52	2,599.82
BEAULIEU	860.92	1,004.41	1,147.89	1,291.38	1,578.35	1,865.33	2,152.30	2,582.76
BOLDRE	864.97	1,009.13	1,153.29	1,297.45	1,585.77	1,874.09	2,162.42	2,594.90
BRAMSHAW	861.62	1,005.22	1,148.83	1,292.43	1,579.64	1,866.84	2,154.05	2,584.86
BRANSGORE	888.30	1,036.35	1,184.40	1,332.45	1,628.55	1,924.65	2,220.75	2,664.90
BREAMORE	868.27	1,012.99	1,157.70	1,302.41	1,591.83	1,881.26	2,170.68	2,604.82
BROCKENHURST	870.41	1,015.47	1,160.54	1,305.61	1,595.75	1,885.88	2,176.02	2,611.22
BURLEY	863.09	1,006.93	1,150.78	1,294.63	1,582.33	1,870.02	2,157.72	2,589.26
COPYTHORNE	859.25	1,002.45	1,145.66	1,288.87	1,575.29	1,861.70	2,148.12	2,577.74
DAMERHAM	866.46	1,010.87	1,155.28	1,299.69	1,588.51	1,877.33	2,166.15	2,599.38
DENNY LODGE	864.65	1,008.76	1,152.87	1,296.98	1,585.20	1,873.42	2,161.63	2,593.96
EAST BOLDRE	864.27	1,008.31	1,152.36	1,296.40	1,584.49	1,872.58	2,160.67	2,592.80
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IF	866.91	1,011.39	1,155.88	1,300.36	1,589.33	1,878.30	2,167.27	2,600.72
EXBURY & LEPE	856.85	999.65	1,142.46	1,285.27	1,570.89	1,856.50	2,142.12	2,570.54
FAWLEY	912.09	1,064.10	1,216.12	1,368.13	1,672.16	1,976.19	2,280.22	2,736.26
FORDINGBRIDGE	896.90	1,046.38	1,195.87	1,345.35	1,644.32	1,943.28	2,242.25	2,690.70
GODSHILL	880.27	1,026.99	1,173.70	1,320.41	1,613.83	1,907.26	2,200.68	2,640.82
HALE	872.26	1,017.64	1,163.01	1,308.39	1,599.14	1,889.90	2,180.65	2,616.78
HORDLE	876.03	1,022.04	1,168.04	1,314.05	1,606.06	1,898.07	2,190.08	2,628.10
HYDE	863.03	1,006.86	1,150.70	1,294.54	1,582.22	1,869.89	2,157.57	2,589.08
HYPHE & DIBDEN	897.49	1,047.07	1,196.65	1,346.23	1,645.39	1,944.55	2,243.72	2,692.46
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	899.15	1,049.00	1,198.86	1,348.72	1,648.44	1,948.15	2,247.87	2,697.44
LYNDHURST	871.86	1,017.17	1,162.48	1,307.79	1,598.41	1,889.03	2,179.65	2,615.58
MARCHWOOD	915.37	1,067.94	1,220.50	1,373.06	1,678.18	1,983.31	2,288.43	2,746.12
MARTIN	867.73	1,012.35	1,156.97	1,301.59	1,590.83	1,880.07	2,169.32	2,603.18
MILFORD-ON-SEA	872.18	1,017.54	1,162.91	1,308.27	1,599.00	1,889.72	2,180.45	2,616.54
MINSTEAD	867.49	1,012.07	1,156.65	1,301.23	1,590.39	1,879.55	2,168.72	2,602.46
NETLEY MARSH	860.31	1,003.69	1,147.08	1,290.46	1,577.23	1,864.00	2,150.77	2,580.92
NEW MILTON	884.16	1,031.52	1,178.88	1,326.24	1,620.96	1,915.68	2,210.40	2,652.48
RINGWOOD	893.37	1,042.26	1,191.16	1,340.05	1,637.84	1,935.63	2,233.42	2,680.10
ROCKBOURNE	867.83	1,012.47	1,157.11	1,301.75	1,591.03	1,880.31	2,169.58	2,603.50
SANDLEHEATH	864.27	1,008.31	1,152.36	1,296.40	1,584.49	1,872.58	2,160.67	2,592.80
SOPLEY	881.83	1,028.80	1,175.77	1,322.74	1,616.68	1,910.62	2,204.57	2,645.48
SWAY	865.43	1,009.66	1,153.90	1,298.14	1,586.62	1,875.09	2,163.57	2,596.28
TOTTON & ELING	922.06	1,075.74	1,229.41	1,383.09	1,690.44	1,997.80	2,305.15	2,766.18
WHITSBURY	864.97	1,009.14	1,153.30	1,297.46	1,585.78	1,874.11	2,162.43	2,594.92
WOODGREEN	867.85	1,012.50	1,157.14	1,301.78	1,591.06	1,880.35	2,169.63	2,603.56

## 65. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND PANELS.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) That Cllr Ault replace Cllr Beck on the Planning Development Control Committee; and

**Council**

**26 FEBRUARY 2007**

- (b) That Cllr Mrs Carpenter be appointed to the Crime and Disorder Review Panel in place of Cllr T Russell.

The Leader of the Council welcomed to the Conservative Group Cllr D Russell.

CHAIRMAN

**Attachments:**

Minute No. 59 – Appendices 1 and 2

(DEMOCRAT/CL260207/MINUTES.DOC)

**BUDGET SPEECH BY COUNCILLOR M J KENDAL, LEADER**

Every year we are in the hands of the Government when it comes to the amount of Council Tax we levy since it depends to a large extent upon the grant which they settle upon our Council.

However this year we were given forewarning last year of a two year settlement and so we have planned throughout the year for an increase to match what we thought might be the inflation rate of not more than 3%.

This still proves difficult because we need not only to fund our capital programme but also to fund the increases in staff salaries and pensions which even at the inflation rate come to far more than the Government grant.

This gap has to be met by Council Tax payers and this year we are meeting it thanks largely to the programme of efficiency savings we instituted last year.

We continue to strive for efficiencies and in the current year we anticipate that we shall have savings of about a quarter of a million pounds when the final accounts are drawn in April 2007.

These savings get added to the contribution which we make from Council Tax payers revenue account to our capital programme account from which we are able to make the major environmental improvements, replace our public toilets, and so on.

We take a forward view over the next four years to ensure that our revenue account is balanced against our expectation of Council Tax and Government grant and we do the same thing with our capital programme so that there is some measure of certainty about the projects which we plan to do.

In recent times this has stood us in good stead in terms of our programme for replacing public toilets with new modern facilities.

We have also done major refurbishments at Hythe Promenade, Milford On Sea, Fawley Town Centre and we are about to commence work in Rumbridge Road, Totton and Water Lane, Totton.

All of these projects run into millions of pounds in total.

All of them are done in consultation with the local Parish or Town Council who sometimes make a modest contribution towards the financial cost.

The major cost is either borne by ourselves and Hampshire County Council as appropriate, with us operating in many cases as the lead agency for Hampshire County Council.

Other major works would include the sea defences at Barton On Sea, Milford On Sea and Lymington but these are dependent on Defra grant monies.

More recently we have invested quite heavily in our Health and Recreation Centres and we have plans to continue with this investment next year and thereafter to ensure that our modern facilities provide precisely what our customers want.

In the financial year 2007/08 we shall be investing a total of £101,000 in New Milton Leisure Centre, £523,000 in Ringwood Leisure Centre over the next two years when we extend the fitness gym area to provide a fifteen station youth gym for our 8 to 16 club, £160,000 over the next two years in the Lymington Leisure Centre and £529,000 in the Totton Leisure Centre also to include the extension of the fitness gymnasium for the 8 to 16 youth club fitness equipment.

The 8 to 16 club room with its own purpose built fitness equipment has proved a hit for young teenagers at Applemore College and I am therefore very keen that we should roll it out to the rest of our Leisure Centres and Totton and Ringwood are clearly two large towns who would benefit from this as soon as possible.

The physical characteristics of the buildings in Lymington and New Milton mean that the logistics of rolling it out in those places mean it may take a year or two longer to do the same thing there.

I believe the 8 to 16 Club plays an important part and the fitness equipment will undoubtedly help to prevent too many of our young teenagers becoming excessively overweight as well as giving them an excellent environment in which to let off steam.

Thus we are meeting one of our major objectives in terms of the Health agenda by working with partners at Hampshire County Council and the Primary Care Trust in order to make our young people more fit as well as contributing to their enjoyment of life.

But in addition to this we have earmarked over £200,000 for additional provisions at the Lymington Community Association, Lymington Town Sailing Club, Lyndhurst Scout Hall, The Ringwood Meeting House, St Mary Magdalene in New Milton, Pennington Children's Centre and a general youth facilities fund all of which are aimed fully or in part towards providing excellent facilities for our young people.

A further £80,000 is to be invested next year in the Dibden Golf Club to improve the drainage and other amenities for our golfers both young and old.



The Keyhaven Quay requires immediate remedial works costing about £185,000 and we've allocated a further £200,000 to the coastal path along Hordle Cliff.

The Calshot Pedestrian Scheme and slipway has been allocated £90,000 for the work which we believe we need to do there.

I mentioned earlier Water Lane and Totton Town Centre. Our contribution to the re-generation of the Town Centre in Totton is close to £300,000 although the total project will be well over a million pounds with the balance of the fund coming from Hampshire County Council and developers' contributions.

Our own building here at Appletree Court needs refurbishment and the roof needs repair in places.

We also need to continue to set aside reserves for the replacement of IT equipment as ever improving software makes existing hardware obsolete.

In looking ahead over the next few years I have therefore taken these matters into account and compared our capital programme with the allocated funding and expected funding from revenue contributions and I believe that we are well placed to meet all our capital requirements over the next four years.

As far as our revenue account is concerned the efficiency savings that I noted earlier have stood us in good stead so that we have not had to reduce frontline services materially.

It is a source of quiet satisfaction to us that we continue to receive excellent ratings from the Audit Commission and that we received one of the highest value for money ratings in the entire country this year.

However what is more important is what our citizens think of us and the service we provide to them, since they are our real customers.

A recent independent poll conducted for the Audit Commission on a postal questionnaire basis saw one in two recipients in the New Forest return their postal questionnaires which is one of the highest rates for this type of poll.

I thus braced myself for the worst knowing that most people who fill in questionnaires are the people who feel they have something to grumble about.

It is a credit to our members and our officers that in the February 2007 published results as many as 67% of those returning their postal questionnaires said that they found our services satisfactory or very satisfactory. Only 8% were dissatisfied. We understand that this was the top rating in Hampshire.

The Audit Commission has published these survey results as Best Value performance indicators and some of the significant findings are:

That the percentage of people satisfied with cleanliness standards that is, open public land, clearing litter and refuse rose to 77%.

The percentage of people expressing satisfaction with New Forest's recycling facilities rose to 88%.

The percentage of people expressing satisfaction with household waste and collection was 84%.

The percentage of residents satisfied with our sports and leisure facilities rose to 72% from 53% in 2003/04.

The percentage of residents satisfied with our parks and open spaces rose to 81%.

Clearly the vast majority of our customers believe that what we are doing is right and that gives me the confidence to continue investing in the way that I mentioned earlier in the facilities that I described all of which are for the benefit of the public of the New Forest District generally.

I am sure you will all join me in congratulating the Portfolio Holders and the Officers concerned in what has turned out to be an excellent result for us this year in respect of services to the public, in respect of efficiencies, and in respect of capital investments for the future of the New Forest District as a whole.

I have been asked why we cannot give the Parking Clock free to our local residents and charge non residents for the clocks. The budget estimate for our present traffic parking management system came to about £1.4m excluding capital charge.

The total income from the £8 Shopping Clock and the £80 Commuter Clock comes to just under half a million pounds.

Added to that would be a further £200,000 which is the kind of figure we estimate that residents of the New Forest pay in parking fees which residents pay who choose not to have a clock perhaps because they have free parking at work and shop infrequently in our village car parks or because they live in say Totton and do not visit other areas often enough to purchase a clock.

We would lose this income along with any fines associated with overstaying parking meters for that group of people.

We would also have to set up identification systems based on car and recipient in order to prevent misuse of the so called free clock as well as systems of administration for changing the clocks registration when people changed their cars.

All of this was pretty cumbersome when the old voucher system was used some years ago and cost us about £100,000 extra a year then.

Those of you who have been keeping count will see that apart from the loss therefore of nearly £700,000 we would have an additional cost of £100,000 which would mean that the Council Tax payer would need to bear the cost of an extra £800,000 or alternatively suffer severe cuts in services since £800,000 is the price of over thirty staff members.

I therefore ask myself why people living in say Fawley, Marchwood or even Totton where there is a free District Council car park would want to pay an extra £11 a year which is the cost of £800,000 at Band D Council Tax rates, why they would want to pay an extra £11 a year in Totton for example to enable people in Lymington, Ringwood, New Milton, Hythe, Milford, Beaulieu and Burley to be able to park without having to pay for a parking clock even though of course they too would be paying more in Council Tax.

Surely the residents of Totton are much better off under the present system where they park free in Totton, do not pay an extra £11 in Council Tax but if they wish to use the village car parks around the New Forest have only to purchase an £8 clock which is fully transferable amongst the various members of their family.

I cannot believe that those that propose to me a residents' so called free parking clock have done any serious thinking on the matter at all.

In a year or so our car parking clock will be available for use on the high streets of some of our main towns when those who do not have a parking clock will need to pay for short stay parking.

This is a system that we will implement with the advice of the local Chambers of Commerce in order to improve the turnaround time and to keep congestion in our high streets to a minimum.

These are the two main objectives of our traffic management system which is being paid for by motorists on a basis which is not only fair and equitable but which is priced well below that of all our neighbours in Hampshire and the rest of the Country.

Perhaps this is why we have received a poll rating of residents showing satisfaction of 67% of those involved.

Presumably if they were dissatisfied with the system that some of our opponents suggest we would have expected a disappointing rating. Only 8% expressed dissatisfaction with our Council services.

Therefore in the summer we shall be keen to see the further results of our progress on traffic management and the way in which our parking clock system is operating to meet our twin objectives.

Indications at this stage are that we would probably recommend to Hampshire County Council that the system be continued on an indefinite basis with an extension to certain high streets of the car parking clock when meters are installed there.

Turning now to housing matters, many new first time buyers and renters are struggling with the accommodation shortage in the New Forest.

It remains a disappointing feature that high land prices and low demolition costs mean that developers tend to want to build expensive flats for profit rather than more modest dwellings which are affordable both in terms of purchase and rent arrangements for the majority of our people who earn around the average wage.

This problem has been exacerbated by the inefficient form of Government funding for affordable housing which has led to delays as well as paucity of funding so that many of our Housing Associations who have been allocated money and approval to build properties in the New Forest by our Planners have not actually been able to do so yet.

In fact in this last year we completed less than our target of 75 homes. There are apparently 38 completions expected with about 118 new starts by the end of this financial year.

We now seek to complete about 120 affordable homes as a target for next year and you all know that there have been tensions in this Council Chamber as we have sought to use any suitable space arising from our own Council's assets in order to make land available for affordable housing.

The provision of these affordable homes remains one of the key objectives of this administration along with safer streets, along with cleaner streets and spaces, along with continued attention to the needs of young people and older folk and all underpinned by a continued search for an ever improving value for money.

Another one of our key objectives has been to ensure that our people young and older enjoy the quality of the place that we provide in a safe manner.

To do this we have already employed four additional Community Safety Officers to work with those from Hampshire and we are hopeful of the ultimate benefits that they will bring in working with their Police counterparts.

We want to combine an approach which is strict but fair on yobbish behaviour and vandalism and graffiti but which also includes giving young people every chance to overcome their mistakes and to become good citizens contributing positively to the society around them.

We do not believe in regulation for regulation sake but we will use powers which we have been given by central Government to improve the quality of life when it becomes necessary as opposed to meeting targets in order to justify salaries.

The latest information from Integra is that the rate per ton that the Council will receive from collection of re-cycleable materials will result in £10,000 more income than has currently been budgeted for and I wish to adjust the nett expenditure requirement figure to allow for this.

So having taken into account the needs of our capital programme and the savings achieved on efficiencies to date I wish to propose two amendments to our earlier recommendation from Cabinet.

The first amendment is to reduce by £100,000 to an amount of £669,000, the required contribution towards the capital programme from the revenue account, to be taken from savings in the current year.

The effect of this leads to my second amendment which is to reduce the Council Tax required to £143.67 which is an increase over last year of only 1.9% and which is less than half the current rate of inflation of 4.4% and amounts to a mere £2.68 per year for the average Council Tax payer, less even than the increase in Totton and Eling Town Council's precept.

Its also less than the rate of 3.6% which was the increment given to old age pensioners by the Chancellor in November last year at the time of his mini budget.

This budget reinforces our key objectives, it includes considerable capital investment, particularly for young people but it ensures value for money for all our Council Tax payers.

That is our direction of travel.

That is what the Audit Commission says we have been doing well.

That is what our customers say they are satisfied with.

That is what I believe we should continue doing.

That is why we have framed this budget for this year.

It meets the needs of this year and it meets the needs of the next few years.

It reduces the increase in Council Tax to a figure well below the inflation rate.

It is in fact the lowest increase in Council Tax by any Council in Hampshire at only 5 pence per week.

I therefore commend the amendment to you and I thank all those members and officers who have made it possible.

Together we can make a difference.

### Liberal Democrat Amendment to Item 4 of the Cabinet Report

The Lib Dem group propose making a number of additions to the budget. You will see that the majority of the proposals are not new to you and that we are being consistent in our aim to improve quality of service, together with reflecting the wishes of our electorate on Health, Safety and Environmental issues. All of this being accomplished with no additional tax burden on the Council Tax payer. These proposals are both sound and logical, however if the Conservative administration vote against them, I can confirm that in the circumstances that we take majority control of the Council after May, we will endeavour to pursue the proposals at the earliest opportunity.

#### **Members Grant Scheme**

We will replace the Rural Assistance grants with a fairer scheme covering both rural and urban areas for all members. This is so that all of us are able to make a small difference to public facilities, services or voluntary groups in our wards. The government are suggesting such schemes and the Conservative administration at Hampshire County Council included £10,000 in their budget for each County Councillor to spend in their divisions. Our proposal is a far more modest £500 per member.

Addition to budget £30,000      Saving from budget £14,000

#### **Community Initiatives Grants**

We would add a small grant fund for use specifically on projects suggested by the residents of the New Forest. This would allow for yet more spending on the things that matter and are considered important by our communities.

Addition to budget £10,000

#### **Kerb Side Glass collection**

We are proposing a scheme that is anticipated to increase the New Forest recycling rate by 5-6%. Many other authorities are already successfully undertaking similar schemes for the benefit of their residents and recycling rates. Boxes would be provided to each household for collection of glass. Four vehicles would be purchased for collection of that glass from the kerb side. The service would be phased in from Oct 2007 and be fully operational by May 2008. Once fully operational the scheme would have a net annual revenue cost of £291K. The initial capital cost would be £584K with an ongoing capital cost of about £19K. The capital element would be provided by way of a loan and the full cost of this is included with the revenue total.

Addition to budget £118,000

### **Scrapping Sun Beds**

There is a clear issue when using sun beds relating to health and having these sun beds within our Leisure Centres is clearly inappropriate. The full year cost of scrapping Sun Beds would be about £51K. But savings are available from relinquishing leases and reuse of the space which is freed up. Indeed, clever change of use could lead to no long term loss of revenue.

Addition to budget £40,000

### **Increased Community Safety initiatives**

If the Tory group truly want me to stop labelling them as being soft on crime then support our proposal to increase funding on Community Safety initiatives. The increased funding level proposed could for example, double our contribution to Accredited Community Safety Officers in the New Forest.

Addition to budget £100,000

### **Climate Change/Green Audit**

The Liberal Democrat group are glad to see that the Green Audit proposed by us is being taken forward. We are also glad that the Climate Change issues are starting to be considered. However, no specific funding has been included within the Conservative budget and so we feel that at least some money should be earmarked for actions resulting from the activities in the forthcoming year.

Addition to budget £50,000

### **Smoke free legislation**

This Council has received funding of £69,000 for use resulting from the Smoke free legislation. This is an important health issue and there is clearly a need to educate the public on the matter. So rather than not allocating this funding, we would propose using it fully for the purpose for which it was intended.

Addition to budget £69,000

### **Reduction in Corporate Communications**

This is clearly an area where savings can be made; less glossy brochures, which would also be of environmental benefit and unnecessary spending on an area which is clearly an over-financed overhead.

Saving from budget £84,000



## Use of under spend

Every year there remains relatively large sums in the budget which have failed to be spent during the year. I understand that this is currently in the region of £280K and could end up being substantially more.

Saving from budget £250,000

So there you have it; Additional spending proposals where they count, as improved services for the community, as improvements to the health and security of our residents and as doing our far share for the environment.

Please support these proposals and do what is right for our community.

Alan Weeks  
26<sup>th</sup> February 2007

## Summary of proposals

Additions to budget:	£
Members Grant Scheme	30,000
Community Initiatives Grants	10,000
Kerb side Glass collection	118,000
Scrapping sun beds	40,000
Increase Community Safety initiatives	100,000
Climate Change/Green Audit	50,000
Smoke Free legislation	69,000
	<b>417,000</b>
These additions would be financed by:	
Replacement of Rural Assistance Grants	14,000
Reduction in Corporate Communications	84,000
Use of under spend	250,000
Smoke Free legislation funding	69,000
	<b>417,000</b>

# LIBERAL DEMOCRAT BUDGET PROPOSALS 2007/08

## Additions to budget:

£

Members Grants Scheme	30,000
Community Initiatives Grants	10,000
Kerb side Glass collection	118,000
Scrapping sun beds	40,000
Increased Community Safety initiatives	100,000
Climate Change/Green Audit	50,000
Smoke Free legislation	69,000
	<b>417,000</b>

## These additions would be financed by:

Replacement of Rural Assistance Grants	14,000
Reduction in Corporate Communications	84,000
Use of under spend	250,000
Smoke Free legislation funding	69,000
	<b>417,000</b>