

21 FEBRUARY 2022

NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the New Forest District Council held on Monday, 21 February 2022

* Cllr Derek Tipp (Chairman)

* Cllr Alan O'Sullivan (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

* Alan Alvey
* Diane Andrews
Ann Bellows
* Sue Bennison
Geoffrey Blunden
* Hilary Brand
* Alex Brunsdon
* Fran Carpenter
* Louise Cerasoli
* Mark Clark
* Steve Clarke
* Jill Cleary
* Anne Corbridge
* Keith Craze
* Kate Crisell
* Jack Davies
* Steve Davies
* Arthur Davis
* Sandra Delemare
* Philip Dowd
* Jan Duke
* Barry Dunning
Jacqui England
* Richard Frampton
* Allan Glass
* Andrew Gossage
* Michael Harris
* David Harrison
* David Hawkins

Councillors:

* Edward Heron
* Jeremy Heron
* Alison Hoare
Maureen Holding
Christine Hopkins
* Mahmoud Kangarani
* Joshua Kidd
* Emma Lane
Martyn Levitt
* Alexis McEvoy
* Ian Murray
* Stephanie Osborne
* Neville Penman
* Caroline Rackham
* Alvin Reid
* Joe Reilly
* Barry Rickman
* Tony Ring
* Steve Rippon-Swaine
David Russell
* Ann Sevier
* Michael Thierry
* Beverley Thorne
* Neil Tungate
* Alex Wade
* Malcolm Wade
* Christine Ward
* John Ward

*Present

Officers Attending:

Alan Bethune, Grainne O'Rourke and Matt Wisdom.

Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Bellows, Blunden, England, Hopkins, Levitt and Russell.

An apology for absence was received from the Chief Executive, Kate Ryan, who was self isolating following a positive Covid test.

An apology for absence was received from Cllr J Davies, who left the meeting at 8.00 pm.

62 MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2021, be confirmed.

63 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

The Chairman confirmed that all Members of the Council had been granted the necessary dispensations to speak and vote on matters concerning the Annual Members' Allowances Scheme, Annual Budget and Council Tax, considered at minutes 68 and 71 below.

Cllr Thorne had been granted a dispensation to speak and vote on the Housing Revenue Account Budget and Housing Public Sector Capital Expenditure Programme 2022/23, considered at minute 68 below. The interest concerned her Council garage. This dispensation did not extend to any common law issue of bias or predetermination.

Cllr A Wade had been granted a dispensation to speak and vote on matters relating to the Annual Budget 2022/23 and Council Tax, considered at minutes 68 and 71 below. The interest concerned his employment by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Fire and Rescue Service. This dispensation did not extend to any common law issue of bias or predetermination.

There were no other declarations of any disclosable pecuniary interests by Members.

64 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Former Cllr Henry Forse

The Chairman referred with great sadness to the recent passing of former Cllr Henry Forse. Henry represented the Bramshaw, Copythorne North and Minstead Ward from 2007 until he stood down in May 2011. Henry was a Member of the Employment, Health and Wellbeing Committee and the Environment Review Panel. He represented the District Council on the Local Government Association Coastal Issues Group

The Chairman expressed his sincere condolences to Henry's family and friends and placed on record the Council's thanks for the service he had given to the District.

Former Cllr Paul Hickman

The Chairman also referred to the very sad news of the recent passing of former Cllr Paul Hickman. Paul was first elected in February 2002 to the Pennington Ward and served as a District Councillor until 2011. Paul was a long standing Member of the Environment Review Panel before later becoming a Member of the Housing Review Panel and Planning Committee. He represented the District Council on a number of Outside Bodies, most notably the New Forest Road Safety Council and the New Forest Highway and Transport Advisory Panel.

The Chairman expressed his sincere condolences to Paul's family and friends and placed on record the Council's thanks for the service he had given to the District.

New Councillor

The Chairman welcomed new Cllr Richard Frampton to his first Full Council meeting following his election in December 2021.

Procedures

The Chairman confirmed his intention to ask the Council to agree to suspend Standing Order 47.6 to allow the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition to exceed the time limit of five minutes on their speeches under the Annual Budget item.

Members were reminded that a number of recorded votes would need to be taken on key budget items.

With a substantial amount of complex business, the Chairman asked for Members' support and cooperation with the smooth running of the meeting.

65 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

66 REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

Cllr Alvey presented the report of the Audit Committee meeting held on 28 January 2022, and moved the adoption of the recommendations. Cllr Lane seconded the motion.

RESOLVED:

That the report be received and the recommendations be adopted.

67 REPORT OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

Cllr Clarke presented the report of the General Purposes and Licensing Committee meeting held on 14 January 2022, and moved the adoption of the recommendations. Cllr Harrison seconded the motion.

RESOLVED:

That the report be received and the recommendations be adopted.

68 REPORTS OF THE CABINET

All Members of the Council had been granted a dispensation to speak and vote on matters concerning the Members' Allowances Scheme, Annual Budget and Council Tax.

Cllr Thorne had been granted a dispensation to speak and vote on the Housing Revenue Account Budget and Housing Public Sector Capital Expenditure Programme 2022/23.

Cllr A Wade had been granted a dispensation to speak and vote on the Annual Budget 2022/23.

The Leader of the Council presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 2 February 2022 and moved the adoption of the recommendations. Cllr Cleary seconded the motion.

RESOLVED:

That the report be received and the recommendations be adopted.

The Leader of the Council then presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 16 February 2022 and moved the adoption of the recommendations. Cllr Cleary seconded the motion.

Paragraph 1 – Report on Proposed Climate Change and Nature Emergency Action Plan and the role the Council will play going forward (Minute No 64)

The Leader of the Opposition welcomed the introduction of the action plan and strategy, which included specific investment in dedicated officer resources to drive the Council's ambitions forward on sustainability.

Paragraph 3 – Housing Revenue Account and Housing Public Sector Capital Expenditure Programme 2022/23 (Minute No 66)

Cllr J Davies moved an amendment to the recommendations, to remove recommendation (b), which stated that, from 03 April 2022, an increase in rents of 4.1% from the 2021/22 weekly rent level, in accordance with Government guidelines, be agreed. Cllr A Wade seconded the amendment.

The Council debated the amendment, and the impact this would have on the proposals contained within the Cabinet report.

The amendment was put to a recorded vote, the outcome of which was as follows:-

Voting for:- Cllrs Brand, Brunsdon, Clark, J Davies, Delemare, Harrison, Kangarani, Osborne, Rackham, A Wade and M Wade.

Voting against:- Cllrs Alvey, Andrews, Bennison, Carpenter, Cerasoli, Clarke, Cleary, Corbridge, Craze, Crisell, S Davies, Davis, Duke, Dunning, Glass, Gossage, Harris, Hawkins, E Heron, J Heron, Hoare, Kidd, Lane, McEvoy, Murray, O'Sullivan, Penman, Reid, Reilly, Rickman, Ring, Rippon-Swaine, Sevier, Thierry, Thorne, Tipp, Tungate, C Ward and J Ward.

Abstaining:- Cllrs Dowd and Frampton.

The amendment was lost, 11 in favour, 39 against, 2 abstaining.

The substantive motion of the Housing Revenue Account Budget as outlined in the report of the Cabinet dated 16 February 2022 was put to a recorded vote, the outcome of which was as follows:-

Voting for:- Cllrs Alvey, Andrews, Bennison, Carpenter, Cerasoli, Clarke, Cleary, Corbridge, Craze, Crisell, S Davies, Davis, Duke, Dunning, Glass, Gossage, Harris, Hawkins, E Heron, J Heron, Hoare, Kidd, Lane, McEvoy, Murray, O'Sullivan, Penman, Reid, Reilly, Rickman, Ring, Rippon-Swaine, Sevier, Thierry, Thorne, Tipp, Tungate, C Ward and J Ward.

Voting against:- Cllrs Brand, Brunsdon, Clark, J Davies, Delemare, Dowd, Harrison, Kangarani, Osborne, Rackham, A Wade and M Wade.

Abstaining:- Cllr Frampton.

The substantive motion was carried, 39 in favour, 12 against, 1 abstaining.

Paragraph 4 – Medium Term Financial Plan and Annual Budget 2022/23

The Chairman moved that Standing Order 47.6 be suspended to allow the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition to exceed the time limit for making their budget speeches. The motion was seconded by the Vice-Chairman and carried.

The Leader of the Council made a statement on the budget as proposed in the report of the Cabinet dated 16 February 2022, a copy of which is attached to these minutes.

The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group made a statement and moved an amendment in the form of an alternative budget. Cllr Clark seconded the amendment. A copy of the alternative budget and statement is attached to these minutes.

The Council debated the Cabinet's budget proposals together with the alternative budget.

The alternative budget was put to a recorded vote, the outcome of which was as follows:-

Voting for:- Cllrs Brand, Brunsdon, Clark, Delemare, Dowd, Frampton, Harrison, Kangarani, Osborne, Rackham, A Wade and M Wade.

Voting against:- Cllrs Alvey, Andrews, Bennison, Carpenter, Cerasoli, Clarke, Cleary, Corbridge, Craze, Crisell, S Davies, Davis, Duke, Dunning, Glass, Gossage, Harris, Hawkins, E Heron, J Heron, Hoare, Kidd, Lane, McEvoy, Murray, O'Sullivan, Penman, Reid, Reilly, Rickman, Ring, Rippon-Swaine, Sevier, Thierry, Thorne, Tipp, Tungate, C Ward and J Ward.

Abstaining:- None.

The amendment and alternative budget was lost, 12 in favour, 39 against, none abstaining.

The substantive motion of the budget as outlined in the report of the Cabinet dated 16 February 2022 was put to a recorded vote, the outcome of which was as follows:-

Voting for:- Cllrs Alvey, Andrews, Bennison, Carpenter, Cerasoli, Clarke, Cleary, Corbridge, Craze, Crisell, S Davies, Davis, Duke, Dunning, Glass, Gossage, Harris, Hawkins, E Heron, J Heron, Hoare, Kidd, Lane, McEvoy, Murray, O'Sullivan, Penman, Reid, Reilly, Rickman, Ring, Rippon-Swaine, Sevier, Thierry, Thorne, Tipp, Tungate, C Ward and J Ward.

Voting against:- Cllrs Brand, Brunsdon, Clark, Delemare, Dowd, Frampton, Harrison, Kangarani, Osborne, Rackham, A Wade and M Wade.

Abstaining:- Cllr Delemare.

The substantive motion was carried, 39 in favour, 11 against, 1 abstaining.

RESOLVED:

That the report be received and the recommendations be adopted.

69 QUESTIONS

There were none.

70 QUESTIONS TO PORTFOLIO HOLDERS UNDER STANDING ORDER 22A

Questions were put and answered under Standing Order 22A as follows:-

- Cllr Glass to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration and Infrastructure, Cllr Andrews, on parking on pavements.
- Cllr Tungate to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Coastal Services, Cllr S Davies, on EV charging points and reducing CO2 emissions.
- Cllr Clark to the Leader of the Council, Cllr E Heron on the Solent Freeport.

Note:-

A copy of the full questions and replies are attached to these minutes.

71 THE 2022/23 COUNCIL TAX

All Members of the Council had been granted dispensations to speak and vote on this item. Cllr A Wade had been granted a dispensation to speak and vote on this item, as an employee of Hampshire and Isle of Wight Fire and Rescue Service.

The Council considered the Council Tax for 2022/23.

The Chairman moved the recommendations in the report. Cllr O'Sullivan seconded the motion.

The recommendations were put to a recorded vote, the outcome of which was as follows:-

Voting for:- Cllrs Alvey, Andrews, Bennison, Brand, Carpenter, Cerasoli, Clarke, Cleary, Corbridge, Craze, Crisell, S Davies, Davis, Delemare, Dowd, Duke, Dunning, Frampton, Glass, Gossage, Harris, Hawkins, E Heron, J Heron, Hoare, Kidd, Lane, McEvoy, Murray, O'Sullivan, Penman, Reid, Reilly, Rickman, Ring, Rippon-Swaine, Sevier, Thierry, Thorne, Tipp, Tungate, C Ward and J Ward.

Voting against:- Cllr Brunsdon.

Abstaining:- Cllrs Clark, Harrison, Kangarani, Osborne, Rackham, A Wade and M Wade.

The recommendations were carried – 43 in favour, 1 against, 7 abstaining.

RESOLVED:

- 1.1 That it be noted that on 6 December 2021 the Council calculated the Council Tax Base for the year 2022/23:
- (a) for the whole Council area as 72,122.10 [Item T in the formula in Section 31B(1) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]; and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in Appendix 3 of the report.
- 1.2 To calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2022/23 (excluding Parish Precepts) is £13,584,920.
- 1.3 That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2022/23 in accordance with Sections 31A, 31B and 34 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 as amended by the Localism Act 2011: -
- (a) £139,820,116 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
 - (b) £119,248,060 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - (c) £20,572,056 being the amount by which the aggregate at 1.3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 1.3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B(1) of the Act).
 - (d) £285.24 being the amount at 1.3(c) above (Item R), all divided by the Council Tax Base, Item T (1.1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act, as

the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).

- (e) £6,987,136 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per Appendix 4 of the report).
- (f) £188.36 being the amount at 1.3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 1.3(e) above by Item T (1.1(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 specifically for the District Council. There are no non-parished areas.
- (g)

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	236.73
BEAULIEU	203.80
BOLDRE	215.79
BRAMSHAW	217.34
BRANSGORE	249.80
BREAMORE	218.58
BROCKENHURST	230.85
BURLEY	206.93
COPYTHORNE	208.49
DAMERHAM	229.98
DENNY LODGE	223.76
EAST BOLDRE	229.63
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	218.92
EXBURY & LEPE	188.36
FAWLEY	327.57
FORDINGBRIDGE	306.52
GODSHILL	239.19
HALE	239.84
HORDLE	238.43
HYDE	211.21
HYPHE & DIBDEN	309.28
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	301.75
LYNDHURST	259.95
MARCHWOOD	307.40
MARTIN	226.98
MILFORD-ON-SEA	238.93
MINSTEAD	220.47
NETLEY MARSH	213.42
NEW MILTON	300.03
RINGWOOD	289.72
ROCKBOURNE	268.94
SANDLEHEATH	218.27
SOPLEY	270.01
SWAY	238.30
TOTTON & ELING	329.20
WHITSBURY	210.16
WOODGREEN	226.74

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 1.3(f) 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 1.1(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.

- (h) These are the District plus Town/Parish Council elements only. See below for the full amounts of Council Tax.

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	157.82	184.12	210.42	236.73	289.34	341.95	394.55	473.46
BEAULIEU	135.86	158.51	181.15	203.80	249.09	294.39	339.66	407.60
BOLDRE	143.86	167.84	191.81	215.79	263.74	311.70	359.65	431.58
BRAMSHAW	144.89	169.04	193.19	217.34	265.64	313.94	362.23	434.68
BRANSGORE	166.53	194.29	222.04	249.80	305.31	360.83	416.33	499.60
BREAMORE	145.72	170.01	194.29	218.58	267.15	315.73	364.30	437.16
BROCKENHURST	153.90	179.55	205.20	230.85	282.15	333.46	384.75	461.70
BURLEY	137.95	160.95	183.93	206.93	252.91	298.91	344.88	413.86
COPYTHORNE	138.99	162.16	185.32	208.49	254.82	301.16	347.48	416.98
DAMERHAM	153.32	178.87	204.42	229.98	281.09	332.20	383.30	459.96
DENNY LODGE	149.17	174.04	198.89	223.76	273.48	323.22	372.93	447.52
EAST BOLDRE	153.08	178.60	204.11	229.63	280.66	331.70	382.71	459.26
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	145.94	170.27	194.59	218.92	267.57	316.23	364.86	437.84
EXBURY & LEPE	125.57	146.50	167.43	188.36	230.22	272.08	313.93	376.72
FAWLEY	218.38	254.78	291.17	327.57	400.36	473.16	545.95	655.14
FORDINGBRIDGE	204.34	238.41	272.46	306.52	374.63	442.76	510.86	613.04
GODSHILL	159.46	186.04	212.61	239.19	292.34	345.50	398.65	478.38
HALE	159.89	186.54	213.19	239.84	293.14	346.44	399.73	479.68
HORDLE	158.95	185.45	211.93	238.43	291.41	344.41	397.38	476.86
HYDE	140.80	164.28	187.74	211.21	258.14	305.09	352.01	422.42
HYPHE & DIBDEN	206.18	240.55	274.91	309.28	378.01	446.75	515.46	618.56
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	201.16	234.70	268.22	301.75	368.80	435.87	502.91	603.50
LYNDHURST	173.30	202.18	231.06	259.95	317.72	375.49	433.25	519.90
MARCHWOOD	204.93	239.09	273.24	307.40	375.71	444.03	512.33	614.80
MARTIN	151.32	176.54	201.76	226.98	277.42	327.87	378.30	453.96
MILFORD-ON-SEA	159.28	185.84	212.38	238.93	292.02	345.13	398.21	477.86
MINSTEAD	146.98	171.48	195.97	220.47	269.46	318.46	367.45	440.94
NETLEY MARSH	142.28	165.99	189.70	213.42	260.85	308.28	355.70	426.84
NEW MILTON	200.02	233.36	266.69	300.03	366.70	433.38	500.05	600.06

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
RINGWOOD	193.14	225.34	257.52	289.72	354.10	418.49	482.86	579.44
ROCKBOURNE	179.29	209.18	239.05	268.94	328.70	388.48	448.23	537.88
SANDLEHEATH	145.51	169.77	194.01	218.27	266.77	315.29	363.78	436.54
SOPLEY	180.00	210.01	240.00	270.01	330.01	390.02	450.01	540.02
SWAY	158.86	185.35	211.82	238.30	291.25	344.22	397.16	476.60
TOTTON & ELING	219.46	256.05	292.62	329.20	402.35	475.52	548.66	658.40
WHITSBURY	140.10	163.46	186.80	210.16	256.86	303.57	350.26	420.32
WOODGREEN	151.16	176.35	201.54	226.74	277.13	327.52	377.90	453.48

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 1.3(g) 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.

- 1.4 That it be noted that Hampshire County Council, the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire and the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Fire Authority have issued precepts for 2022/23 to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated below:

PRECEPTING AUTHORITY

PRECEPTING AUTHORITY	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	927.24	1,081.78	1,236.32	1,390.86	1,699.94	2,009.02	2,318.10	2,781.72
POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR HAMPSHIRE AUTHORITY	157.64	183.91	210.19	236.46	289.01	341.55	394.10	472.92
HAMPSHIRE AND ISLE OF WIGHT FIRE AUTHORITY	50.29	58.67	67.05	75.43	92.19	108.95	125.72	150.86
	1,135.17	1,324.36	1,513.56	1,702.75	2,081.14	2,459.52	2,837.92	3,405.50

- 1.5 That the Section 151 Officer be given delegated authority to implement any variation to the overall level of Council Tax arising from the final notification of the Hampshire County Council precept.
- 1.6 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 1.3(h) and 1.4 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011), hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2022/23 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings shown as follows:-

LOCAL COUNCIL AREA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
ASHURST & COLBURY	1,292.99	1,508.48	1,723.98	1,939.48	2,370.48	2,801.47	3,232.47	3,878.96
BEAULIEU	1,271.03	1,482.87	1,694.71	1,906.55	2,330.23	2,753.91	3,177.58	3,813.10
BOLDRE	1,279.03	1,492.20	1,705.37	1,918.54	2,344.88	2,771.22	3,197.57	3,837.08
BRAMSHAW	1,280.06	1,493.40	1,706.75	1,920.09	2,346.78	2,773.46	3,200.15	3,840.18
BRANSGORE	1,301.70	1,518.65	1,735.60	1,952.55	2,386.45	2,820.35	3,254.25	3,905.10
BREAMORE	1,280.89	1,494.37	1,707.85	1,921.33	2,348.29	2,775.25	3,202.22	3,842.66
BROCKENHURST	1,289.07	1,503.91	1,718.76	1,933.60	2,363.29	2,792.98	3,222.67	3,867.20
BURLEY	1,273.12	1,485.31	1,697.49	1,909.68	2,334.05	2,758.43	3,182.80	3,819.36
COPYTHORNE	1,274.16	1,486.52	1,698.88	1,911.24	2,335.96	2,760.68	3,185.40	3,822.48
DAMERHAM	1,288.49	1,503.23	1,717.98	1,932.73	2,362.23	2,791.72	3,221.22	3,865.46
DENNY LODGE	1,284.34	1,498.40	1,712.45	1,926.51	2,354.62	2,782.74	3,210.85	3,853.02
EAST BOLDRE	1,288.25	1,502.96	1,717.67	1,932.38	2,361.80	2,791.22	3,220.63	3,864.76
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY	1,281.11	1,494.63	1,708.15	1,921.67	2,348.71	2,775.75	3,202.78	3,843.34
EXBURY & LEPE	1,260.74	1,470.86	1,680.99	1,891.11	2,311.36	2,731.60	3,151.85	3,782.22
FAWLEY	1,353.55	1,579.14	1,804.73	2,030.32	2,481.50	2,932.68	3,383.87	4,060.64
FORDINGBRIDGE	1,339.51	1,562.77	1,786.02	2,009.27	2,455.77	2,902.28	3,348.78	4,018.54
GODSHILL	1,294.63	1,510.40	1,726.17	1,941.94	2,373.48	2,805.02	3,236.57	3,883.88
HALE	1,295.06	1,510.90	1,726.75	1,942.59	2,374.28	2,805.96	3,237.65	3,885.18
HORDLE	1,294.12	1,509.81	1,725.49	1,941.18	2,372.55	2,803.93	3,235.30	3,882.36
HYDE	1,275.97	1,488.64	1,701.30	1,913.96	2,339.28	2,764.61	3,189.93	3,827.92
HYTHE & DIBDEN	1,341.35	1,564.91	1,788.47	2,012.03	2,459.15	2,906.27	3,353.38	4,024.06
LYMINGTON & PENNINGTON	1,336.33	1,559.06	1,781.78	2,004.50	2,449.94	2,895.39	3,340.83	4,009.00
LYNDHURST	1,308.47	1,526.54	1,744.62	1,962.70	2,398.86	2,835.01	3,271.17	3,925.40
MARCHWOOD	1,340.10	1,563.45	1,786.80	2,010.15	2,456.85	2,903.55	3,350.25	4,020.30
MARTIN	1,286.49	1,500.90	1,715.32	1,929.73	2,358.56	2,787.39	3,216.22	3,859.46
MILFORD-ON-SEA	1,294.45	1,510.20	1,725.94	1,941.68	2,373.16	2,804.65	3,236.13	3,883.36
MINSTEAD	1,282.15	1,495.84	1,709.53	1,923.22	2,350.60	2,777.98	3,205.37	3,846.44
NETLEY MARSH	1,277.45	1,490.35	1,703.26	1,916.17	2,341.99	2,767.80	3,193.62	3,832.34
NEW MILTON	1,335.19	1,557.72	1,780.25	2,002.78	2,447.84	2,892.90	3,337.97	4,005.56
RINGWOOD	1,328.31	1,549.70	1,771.08	1,992.47	2,435.24	2,878.01	3,320.78	3,984.94
ROCKBOURNE	1,314.46	1,533.54	1,752.61	1,971.69	2,409.84	2,848.00	3,286.15	3,943.38
SANDLEHEATH	1,280.68	1,494.13	1,707.57	1,921.02	2,347.91	2,774.81	3,201.70	3,842.04
SOPLEY	1,315.17	1,534.37	1,753.56	1,972.76	2,411.15	2,849.54	3,287.93	3,945.52
SWAY	1,294.03	1,509.71	1,725.38	1,941.05	2,372.39	2,803.74	3,235.08	3,882.10
TOTTON & ELING	1,354.63	1,580.41	1,806.18	2,031.95	2,483.49	2,935.04	3,386.58	4,063.90
WHITSBURY	1,275.27	1,487.82	1,700.36	1,912.91	2,338.00	2,763.09	3,188.18	3,825.82
WOODGREEN	1,286.33	1,500.71	1,715.10	1,929.49	2,358.27	2,787.04	3,215.82	3,858.98

72 ALLOCATION OF SEATS AND APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES AND PANELS

The Leader of the Council moved the adoption of the recommendations contained within the report, which asked the Council to make appointments to committees and panels in accordance with the principles as set out in Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989. Cllr Cleary seconded the motion.

The Council, having received both the wishes of the political groups and the preferences of the non-aligned Members, considered the option to allocate seats to the non-aligned Members as nearly as possible in proportion to the number of those members on the Council.

RESOLVED:

1. That the allocation of seats to committees and panels in accordance with the principles set out in the report, be agreed as at paragraph 4.6 of the report; and
2. That the Council gives effect to the wishes of the political groups in making appointments to these Committees and Panels, for the remainder of the four year period ending May 2023.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

Leader's Budget Speech – Council 21st February 2022

Members, we meet to set this Council's budget for the coming financial year at what is hopefully the closing days of the Covid pandemic. Of course, we must still take sensible precautions and remain vigilant for new variants, but the days of legal restrictions will soon be behind us.

Before looking to the future, please bear with me a moment as I just recap on how this Council responded to the pandemic as, I believe we can be justly proud. Within days of the first lockdown being announced on the 23rd March 2020, this Council took measures to protect vital frontline services such as our waste collection service, implemented measures to enable home working, and responded to government's requests, including providing support for those shielding, and getting 'everyone in'. I am sure all Councillors will join me in expressing our heartfelt gratitude to all Council Officers, who went above and beyond to support our New Forest communities. As a small token of our gratitude, we will be holding a thank you event for council staff at Appletree Court, when safe to do so later in the year.

The Council administered an unprecedented level of support to our local businesses, over £123million, through grants and business rates discounts. And were commended on our approach by businesses who appreciated the speed at which payments hit their bank accounts.

And on top of the government's furlough scheme, we have provided over £19million of support to our residents through direct payments and council tax support, helping those most in need.

But now we must look forwards, with new challenges to meet, such as the rising cost of living, particularly energy costs.

While there are doubters on the left, history has shown us that the best way to improve living standards is not through state controlled handouts, but through growing private enterprise, while at the same time ensuring greater access and opportunity for all those within our community.

We will work with partners, from the private, public, charitable and education sectors to both drive economic growth within the District, but also to ensure our residents have the access to the training and skills they need to take advantage of new employment opportunities, to help them improve their and their families lives in a way that is sustainable for the long-term.

The Solent Freeport offers a once in a generation opportunity to do just this on the Waterside and beyond. It will not be a panacea to the economic challenges ahead, no one has claimed it will be, and it will not be without its challenges. Especially around the infrastructure required to make it successful and ensure that it does not cause further congestion or environmental damage. However, with over £1/2billion of public money predicted to be available to tackle these issues, there has not been a better opportunity to revitalise the economy of the Waterside since the refinery in

1920s or the Power Station in 1960s. This is a once in a generation opportunity and this Conservative administration will seize it.

Of course, there are members of the opposition who are sceptical about the benefits the Freeport will bring, and that is fine. I mean, being Liberal Democrats they'll of course claim it was their idea if it's successful, but that's just what they do. It's human nature to fear change, but we live in a changing world and we do our community no favours by being left behind, so I ask what alternatives do these nay-sayers offer? What plan do they offer to provide new, skilled jobs to the residents of the New Forest? What opportunities do they offer for those who might wish to start a new business to supply and support this new Freeport? None.

The experts, not me, the experts that the LibDems exult we should listen to whenever it suits them, estimate that the Solent Freeport will create 26,000 jobs and £2billion GVA directly within the Solent.

But still, we Conservatives want more for our residents across our District. We want more for the residents of Totton and the Waterside, that's why this budget makes provision of over £1million for the regeneration of our town centres and to increase sustainability across the District. To drive local employment and economic growth, not by seeking to supplant the private sector, but to support enterprise by fostering opportunity and providing the skills our residents need to benefit from a growing local economy.

The Council will begin consulting with the Town Council, community groups and residents of Totton this summer, about their vision for the town over the next 20 years. We will work with partners, public and private, to deliver the community's aspirations and revitalise Totton town centre, to ensure that it is a vibrant and sustainable community for this and future generations.

We are only able to invest in our communities, especially in the aftermath of the pandemic, because of this Conservative-run Council's sound management of our own finances. We will continue to make prudent decisions, to ensure that we deliver for our residents, but in a way that is financially sustainable.

No Conservative administration wants to increase Council tax and we are no exception, however with UK inflation currently at over 5%, and our own energy costs predicted to increase by over 90%, it would not be prudent to make any other decision. Therefore, this budget, at just under £21million, proposes an increase of five pounds on a band D dwelling, bringing the total share of the Council Tax that this Council will receive to £188.36 per band D property for the coming year, less than three pounds sixty-three per week.

While no-one wants to see their overall Council Tax bill increase, for this year at least, with the £150 government council tax support payment, more than 60% of households with our District will pay less Council Tax in the coming year than last, by about eighty-five pounds.

Our Housing Revenue Account budget includes maintenance budgets of over £10million, and includes a budget to improve fire safety measures of £5½million .

It's also a budget that includes over £14million in the coming year to fund additional housing numbers to improve the possibility of more families coming off our home search register and into their own home. If we do not increase rents, we have to spend less on maintenance, less on safety measures, or less on new housing; I wonder which the opposition leader would prefer?

Members know that our medium-term financial plan shows a deficit of just under £1.9million by 2025. This is a challenge, but through our sensible investments in service efficiency, for example the over £600,000 a year set aside to implement our ICT strategy, increased investment property income, an additional £278,000 this year, and other efficiencies, such as reviewing our corporate estate, in light of new ways of working, I am confident that this gap can be closed.

Our General Fund Capital programme for the coming year totals over £17million. Delivery of vital Capital projects, such as over £3.6million for coastal monitoring and works, £7million to sustain and modernise our waste and recycling service and nearly £5million for our economic sustainability and regeneration projects, and now £½million to increase the Council's sustainability and help deliver on our climate change and nature emergency action plan, is made possible through the reserves we have accumulated and the Council's track record of making revenue contributions to capital financing, when it is able to do so.

Members, while there is much to be optimistic about for the future, many of our residents are worried about rising inflation and the impact this has on household budgets, especially for those already struggling from the financial effect of the pandemic. The average household will see their gas and electricity bills increase by 54% in April. It is therefore even more important that we help our residents reduce their energy consumption, not only to offset some of the energy price increase, but also to reduce carbon emissions. It is not a question of cutting costs or carbon, it is possible to do both. For example, having 270mm of loft insulation can save a householder around £165 a year on their energy bills. Through the implementation of our Climate Change and Nature Emergency Action Plan we will engage with residents and work with partners to provide advice on how they can increase their environmental sustainability and reduce their energy usage and cost.

We will continue to support our most vulnerable residents, for example we have committed to provide £600,000 funding to Citizens Advice New Forest over the next three years and we have awarded over £215,000 in community grants this year, with no plans to reduce the funding available in future years. Our funding combines with the funding and tremendous efforts of others whether through charities, individuals and other organisations that enables us together to support our residents and unique community.

Members, £7million investment in sustaining and modernising our waste and recycling service, including £4million for a new depot. Investment that will help increase our recycling rate, in a sustainable way, and ensure we provide a modern, high quality service into the future.

£10million to improve and maintain our Council housing stock.

£1.7million to meet corporate plan priorities, including regeneration of our town centres, starting with Totton, and increase the Council's and our District sustainability.

A Solent Freeport, delivering 26,000, 8,000 of which will be within the Waterfront cluster. And predicted to deliver £1.6billion of private sector investment, on top of the £½billion public funding.

A General Fund Capital Programme of over £17million and a Housing Revenue Account capital programme of nearly £25million in the coming year.

And if that isn't enough, increasing the grant every for member to support small projects within their community to £1,000, so that members can help their communities celebrate Her Majesty's Platinum Jubilee.

All this and over 60% of households paying £85 less Council Tax than last year.

Leader of the Opposition - Budget Speech

The Conservatives have run this council for over 20 years although few of you were there then. During that time collectively they have become comfortable in thinking they know all the answers and are doing everything right. The administration has become complacent and conservative with a little change doing a bit but actually never enough to make a difference to the quality of New Forest residents' lives that it could. That conservatism in politics and outlook has led to a lack of ambition, initiative and focus on what is really needed and this budget reflects that state of affairs.

For example the housing needs register is currently 1408 mixed bedroom properties but the plan is only to build 600 homes by 2026, 42% of those needed, no ambition to deal fully with the ongoing issue. In contrast Liberal Democrats would look to solve the housing need problem not just let them roll on.

The government has provided extra funding and that combined with the prudent management of the finances by the officers of the council have put this council in a comfortable place despite the impact of the pandemic and the potential future loss of business rates on the horizon. So is the administration looking to give something to the New Forest council taxpayers to help those that need it? No, this budget does not address the needs of our most vulnerable residents, it does not know who they are and, of course, it does not address the issues that need action.

The administration makes decisions without the data on those most in need, it wants to raise rents by 4.1%, for example, based upon the tenant representative suggesting that it is fair. What about the social economic position of our tenants as a whole? Is there empirical evidence for how many residents in the New Forest are in fuel poverty even before the April rise? No. Is there a clear understanding of how many New Forest residents use food bank? No. Yet you make decisions like the rent rises without knowing the precise impact they will have on people in need or people on the edge of need. Perhaps worst of all, the council used to discuss the issue of Child poverty. I asked a NFDC officer for the current data and the officer did not know, the council did not know. I do not blame the officer it is because it is not a council priority, it is not even on this administration's radar.

Well on 20/21 figures amongst our New Forest school age children there are 16.20% on free school meals compared to 15.50% across the county and 16% across the South East region. These figures equate to 3,347 children being in poverty. The Liberal Democrats recognise the seriousness of this problem and the importance of helping these young children in need before their situation leads to even more severe issues. The Liberal Democrats propose allocating £50,000 for a resource to investigate and work with other agencies to focus on solutions to this serious issue. No New Forest child should live in poverty in the 21st century.

Taking young people out of poverty and into employment should be a focus to prevent the cyclic occurrence of poverty, crime and deprivation that exist in some parts of our district even today. What are you doing about apprenticeships beyond

the few working in the council itself and how many have you created outside the council by encouraging local organisations to take them on? This administration should be doing more to help the young. The Liberal Democrats propose another £50,000 be allocated to increase apprenticeship and other training opportunities, The benefits for young people and the district are clear as we are helping create the council taxpayers of tomorrow by ensuring they are given the skills and training to become fully employed, contributing to society and having a productive, positive life.

What can happen when we do not deal with the impact of deprivation? Sadly, all too often for some it turns to crime and disorder and whilst we have a comparatively safe district compared to other parts of the UK, there is still crime. Crime figures are not decreasing. In reality there were 12,788 crimes in the New Forest during 2020 and the under resourced Police service has nothing like the number of officers it had before the Conservative government slashed the staffing to the bare minimum. One of the cuts removed crime prevention officers and the crime prevention work, which was so valued.

We Liberal Democrats recognise that feeling safe in our communities is a fundamental part of the quality of life, which we as councillors should have as a main priority. So we propose allocating £50,000 to fund a crime prevention officer working in our community safety team and a further £50,000 on resources to fund a crime prevention programme and initiatives. This will not only help reduce crime through practical crime prevention activities but help reduce the fear of crime by providing appropriate advice to help people feel safer and secure in their own communities.

We have an ageing population (more than 53,000 over 65). With age comes an increasing need of medical help and support. That very often goes hand in hand with a reduced capacity to drive themselves to medical appointments. There are some charitable organisations which can help, but it is not enough. New Forest residents, and in particular those in the eastern half of the district, often need to get to Lymington hospital or the General hospital in Southampton. There is no direct public transport to take them. No regular bus service and if there are no hospital cars available they either have to get a relative with a car or pay high taxi fares to get to much needed hospital appointments. This is not what our elderly residents want, nor deserve. The Liberal Democrats propose allocating £200,000 and working in partnership with Hampshire County Council, our local Town and Parish councils and bus companies to provide a regular bus service to the hospitals. Liberal Democrats believe we should extend help and support to our elderly residents.

Now, how would we fund it? The administration has been squirreling money away before into reserves only now is it taking £1.25 million and putting it in the capital budget to pay for any pension fund imbalances. It is a little piggy bank that can be raided if you wish for other things but we know the pension fund over recent years has done rather well and has not needed a top-up as it did in the past. Therefore I propose we take the £400,000 from this nest egg to fund our proposals, which still leaves over £800,000 in the administration's special reserve. After all, if the administration can move £300,000 from the General Fund to the capital fund to pay

for Lymington's toilets you can put less money in the capital fund to help with revenue items, which will help New Forest people.

Members of the administration you do not know all the answers, nor are you really in touch with what our residents need. You do not listen to what is said on the doorstep, we do. You do not look beyond your party philosophy, we do. You exist in a New Forest Conservative bubble, which will burst unless you listen to those outside the complacent 'its ok' world you live in. Listen to those, who want to help ordinary New Forest people, hear what is needed and support these Liberal Democrat alternative budget proposals. Be here for the people not the party!

This page is intentionally left blank

ALTERNATIVE BUDGET PROPOSALS 2022/23

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 Council is requested to accept the following amendments to the administration's proposed budget for 2022/23;
- 1.1.1 Hospital Transport Initiatives; £200,000
 - 1.1.2 Crime Prevention; £100,000
 - 1.1.3 Child Poverty Resource; £50,000
 - 1.1.4 Increased Apprenticeships and Training Opportunities within the Council; £50,000

to be funded by a lower revenue budget contribution towards Capital Programme Financing.

The proposals still fall within the administration's proposed Council Tax level and proposed General Fund budget of £20,674,420.

2. ALTERNATIVE BUDGET PROPOSALS

- 2.1 The Leader of the Liberal Democrat party would like to propose adjustments to the Medium Term Financial Plan and Annual Budget 2022/23 that is being presented to the Council within the Cabinet papers from the meeting dated 16 Feb 2022.
- 2.2 Within the presented Medium Term Financial Plan and Annual Budget 2022/23, the administration have proposed additional budgetary provision of £250,000 per annum over the period to 2025/26, with a supplementary additional £200,000 in 2022/23. These funds are currently held within the Finance, Investment and Corporate Services Portfolio.
- 2.3 Whilst the Liberal Democrat party welcome the initiatives as outlined in the administration's budget, we do not believe these sums (para 2.2) will go far enough to cover the list of priorities being outlined.
- 2.4 It is also our collective view that the proposed budget is missing commitments to deliver enhancements in areas that we believe would be of significant benefit to residents across the District. The alternative budget proposes the following;
- a) **Hospital Transport Initiatives;** an additional funding commitment of £200,000 per annum towards public transport initiatives. This funding would look to improve on access to Lymington and the General Hospitals for New Forest residents, who have limited means to get to these vital public services. With the District Council showing a commitment to invest, it would open the door to engagement with Hampshire County Council and local Parish councils and other organisations over longer term funding arrangements.

- b) **Crime Prevention;** an additional funding commitment of £100,000 per annum to be included within the General Fund budget to fund a new focused crime prevention officer at a cost of c£50,000 per annum, with the remaining £50,000 being available to fund outreach and a new focused crime prevention programme.
 - c) **Child Poverty Resource;** an additional funding commitment of £50,000 per annum to provide a dedicated resource to work with other agencies to address this serious problem in the New Forest district.
 - d) **Increased Apprenticeships and Training Opportunities within the Council;** an additional funding commitment of £50,000 towards providing apprenticeships across the Council. This commitment would support employment and training opportunities within the Council.
- 2.5 The administration's budget retains a £1.25m budget within the General Fund, aligned to the value of an annual pension fund deficit payment in previous years. In 2022/23, this budget is being used to provide finance to the Council's Capital Programme. We do not believe the schemes within the Capital Programme would be impacted if this financing support were to be reduced by £400,000, and support a retained pension fund deficit budget of £850,000, instead of £1.25m.
- 2.6 The summary as follows demonstrates the changes in a format easily comparable with the administration's presentation of the proposed budget;

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2021-2025

GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2022/23

PORTFOLIO REQUIREMENTS

Business , Tourism and High Streets
 Environment and Coastal Services
 Finance, Investment and Corporate Services
 Housing and Homelessness Services
 Leader
 Partnering and Wellbeing
 People and Places
 Planning, Regeneration and Infrastructure

Reversal of Depreciation
 Contribution to/(from) Earmarked Revenue Reserves
 Contribution to Reserves

NET PORTFOLIO REQUIREMENTS

Minimum Revenue Provision
 Contribution to Capital Programme Financing (RCCO)
 Interest Earnings (Net)
 New Homes Bonus

GENERAL FUND NET BUDGET REQUIREMENTS

COUNCIL TAX CALCULATION

Budget Requirement
 Less:
 Settlement Funding Assessment
 Lower Tier Services Grant
 Services Grant
 Council Tax Reduction Support Grant
 Business Rates Baseline
 Locally Retained Business Rates
 Budget Equalisation Reserve
 Estimated Collection Fund (Surplus)/Deficit Business Rates
 Estimated Collection Fund (Surplus)/Deficit Council Tax
 Irrecoverable Tax Loss Grant

COUNCIL TAX

TAX BASE NUMBER OF PROPERTIES

COUNCIL TAX PER BAND D PROPERTY

GENERAL FUND BALANCE 31 MARCH

Administration	Report	Proposed	Alternative
2022/23	ref.	Changes	2022/23
£'000's		£'000's	£'000's
Budget			Budget
297			297
4,100			4,100
3,778			3,778
2,025			2,025
496	d	50	546
3,013	b / c	150	3,163
3,713			3,713
2,696	a	200	2,896
20,118		400	20,518
-1,589			-1,589
-38			-38
0			0
18,491		400	18,891
1,571			1,571
1,750	a/b/c/d	-400	1,350
-772			-772
-366			-366
20,674		0	20,674
20,674			20,674
-179			-179
-276			-276
0			0
-3,997			-3,997
-4,452			-4,452
-2,185			-2,185
0			0
-199			-199
-253			-253
0			0
13,585		0	13,585
72,122.10			72,122.10
188.36			188.36
3,000			3,000

This page is intentionally left blank

FULL COUNCIL – 21 FEBRUARY 2022 – QUESTIONS TO PORTFOLIO HOLDERS UNDER STANDING ORDER 22A

First Questions

Question 1

From Cllr Allan Glass to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration and Infrastructure, Cllr Diane Andrews

I have received requests from people who have had to walk or take children in buggies, also users of mobility scooters or wheelchairs on to the road because cars, trucks and vans park on the pavement often blocking the pedestrian use they are provided for. This puts the persons having to walk or wheel into the traffic at considerable risk.

Could NFDC investigate and as no laws exist currently consider obtaining a bye law to prevent vehicles parking one or more wheels on the pavement?

Answer:

The Department for Transport started a consultation exercise on this topic in late 2020 and the results are currently being reviewed. If a ban on parking on pavements was introduced outside London then it would be the Highway Authority (HCC) who would be responsible for the enforcement of such a ban within the district. A bye law would be ineffective and toothless in terms of enforcement. In addition, the police have powers to deal with unnecessary obstruction of the highway which includes the pavement and where they deem this to be an obstruction offence they can remove vehicles and where necessary prosecute the owner of the vehicle.

Note – in response to a supplementary question on encouraging police engagement on the issue, the Portfolio Holder provided the details of the Hampshire Chief Inspector.

Question 2

From Cllr Neil Tungate to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Coastal Services, Cllr Steve Davies

During the past six months, as I have awaited delivery of an electric vehicle on a slow boat from Korea, I have obviously become interested in matters surrounding EV use. I note the Environment Portfolio Holder's dashboard contains an assertion that more than four tonnes of CO2 emissions have been saved through the installation of EV charging points in NFDC car parks. Whilst I welcome CO2 emission reduction, it is unclear how this number is derived because overall electricity generation is not carbon free. Can the portfolio holder please explain?

Answer:

It is important to assure our customers that they are in fact helping to reduce carbon emissions. When cars are charged in NFDC car parks, the power is 100% carbon free. The electricity is 100% renewable from hydro, solar or wind power.

I think the hydro source is fascinating since it comes via interconnector from Norway – similar to that provided to Northumberland and North Tyneside.

The grid is run by Statkraft, a Norwegian company.

Question 3

From Cllr Mark Clark to the Leader of the Council, Cllr Edward Heron

During a recent presentation made by KPMG to this Council about freeports, much was made of the potential influx of jobs into the area. A figure of 8,000 was mentioned.

Of course, there was nothing stopping the UK from setting up tariff and tax-free import zones when it was a member of the EU (around 80 such zones are in operation across the bloc today).

However, the EU zones can't deviate from single market regulations, including those on employment protections and other workers' rights.

But Freeports in the UK won't be bound by this rule, so anyone working in them is likely to have less protection at work – not only with the EU but with the rest of the UK as well.

That means lower pay and less job security in coastal communities such as ours.

Freeports encourage tax avoidance and are likely to become tax havens. That means less money for our NHS and schools. Several academic studies have debunked the suggestion that free ports even create that many jobs or stimulate growth.

It found that, while there was significant job reallocation when businesses moved from local areas to the new zones, the net impact on overall job creation was negligible.

Can the Leader of the Council assure us that these issues have been taken into account and that a firm plan is being worked up with KPMG to bring in these magical thousands of jobs but that they are duly protected with workers' rights being maintained?

Answer:

There is no change in Freeports between employment protection legislation and the rest of the United Kingdom. Therefore, I see no reason why there would be any greater risk of exploitation for employees within a Freeport, than anywhere else located with our District. For those of us who believe that the British Government is the best place to set employment and other laws, the Freeport makes no difference.