

FORDINGBRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of the Annual Town Assembly held on Tuesday, 23rd May 2023 at 7.00pm in the Town Hall, Fordingbridge

(Minutes subject to approval at the next Annual Town Assembly)

Present:

Cllr. White (Mayor)

Councillors Bailey, Cameron, Hale, Hinton, Jackson, Lewendon, Millar, Paton, Perkins, Shering & Wilson

In attendance:

Paul Goddard, Town Clerk

Martine Coatham, RFO

Tim Guymer, Policy and Infrastructure Service Manager – NFDC

Stephen Belli, Senior Planning Officer – NFDC

Phil Woods, NFDC Councillor

22 members of the public

1. To receive apologies for absence

Apologies received from Cllr Heron, HCC

2. To approve the minutes of the Annual Town Assembly of 1st June 2022 and to report any matters arising.

It was proposed by Cllr Lewendon and seconded by Cllr Paton that the minutes of the Annual Town Assembly held on 1st June 2022 be signed as a true record. All in favour. No matters arising.

3. To welcome the guest speakers, Tim Guymer (“TG”) and Stephen Belli (“SB”) of the NFDC: “Planning and Development in Fordingbridge” (Presentation attached)

TG introduced himself and SB and said they were going to provide a planning policy update followed by an update on the strategic sites allocated at Fordingbridge.

They would cover the planning responsibilities in the New Forest, the current planning context including national reforms, a planning policy update for the NFDC and an overview of the Fordingbridge sites.

TG showed a map showing the areas the NFDC has responsibility for, to the east, south and west of the National Park. The planning system is complex and the NFDC operates within the context of national (legislation and the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”)) and local (the Local Plan, Neighbourhood Plans and planning applications) policies. The NFDC’s role is to interpret national policy at a local level (and there are also Neighbourhood Plans at a very local level). TG advised that an area for a Neighbourhood Plan had been designated in Fordingbridge. TG clarified the designated area (the parish boundaries) and said he would talk about settlement boundaries later in the presentation. He advised that an adopted Neighbourhood Plan would mean that a town or parish council would receive 25% (instead of 15%) of a developer’s Community Infrastructure Levy (“CIL”) payments. It also sets out what is wanted at a local level, albeit it needs to tie in with the Local Plan.

TG referred to planning policy headlines: a government target of 300,000 homes, the importance of beauty in new housing developments but also the need for more homes. He summarised a letter from Michael Gove regarding the Levelling Up and Regeneration bill. It spoke about reassessing the planning system and that housing needs need to be considered in the context of the constraints of a specific area. Previously the government had an algorithm (which Michael Gove now says does not work) but the NFDC had managed to adopt its Local Plan prior to the algorithm having to be applied.

The levelling up bill is currently at the House of Lords stage. It addresses levelling up/reducing inequality, amendments to the planning system, giving more weight to local planning policy, improving design coding to produce better quality, sympathetic developments and digitalising the planning system. An NPPF consultation resulted in around 26,000 responses so the government has found it difficult to proceed with reform.

At local level, in the context of the Local Plan there have been four documents adopted in 2005, 2009, 2014 and most recently the Local Plan Part 1 adopted in 2020. The Local Plan adopted in 2020 set out a housing requirement of 10,420 dwellings over a 20 year period, with 6,000 of these being on allocated sites, of which 1,820 were allocated to the Avon Valley including 870 dwellings in Fordingbridge (in addition to the 145 dwellings on Augustus Park). The Local Plan took nine years from commencement to adoption and involved three rounds of public consultation. It is during this period that suggestions are made to alter settlement boundaries and this is then considered by elected members and then approved by the planning inspectorate.

The NFDC have launched today a supplementary planning document in relation to climate change. Its purpose is to clarify how developers address climate change in their applications and to make sure developments are climate change optimised. The document is to make developers consider climate change at an early stage. The document is out for consultation for eight weeks with effect from today (it has taken a year to get to this stage) and it will then be referred the NFDC cabinet. Once an adopted supplementary planning document it will have an element of weight when considering planning applications, albeit there is a need to consider the whole scheme. The requirement for solar panels on new dwellings was put on hold by a previous administration as there were concerns about viability. Not all properties are suited to solar panels. In the context of climate change, the NFDC is looking to push the parameters but are bound by the existing planning system and by law. As a supplementary planning document, it sets aspirations and objectives and it is for SB and the other planning officers to consider it when looking at applications. The NFDC has sought to set a high bar but would welcome comments during the consultation. It is looking at decarbonising buildings, achieving net zero or at least net zero achievable on developments. Examples would include encouraging sustainable travel, having electric vehicle charging points, reducing embedded carbon emissions, orientation, SUDS etc. The consultation starts today and runs to 11th July. There is a newly elected council and the officers have not had an opportunity to talk to new members, however TG estimates that the supplementary planning document is likely go to cabinet for consideration in the autumn of this year.

CIL is levied to help deliver infrastructure to support development in an area. It is payable on development over 100sqm or where a new house is being built. The current charge is £109.23 per sqm (it is index linked). Parish and town councils receive 15-25% of CIL receipts. The NFDC publish an annual statement as to where CIL is spent. TG was asked when the NFDC would have a CIL governance framework setting out how funds for projects could be bid for (an approach has already been made to the NFDC to improve the area behind the Co-Op but there is currently no governance statement in place). TG advised that the CIL funds received to date have been allocated to the Recreational Mitigation Project. To comply with legislation the planning inspectorate has advised the NFDC that it needs to use CIL funds to mitigate the impact of development on the National Park. An example of this is a circular walk at Poulner Lakes. There have been 25-30 such projects delivered. The NFDC does not have a governance framework in place yet as it has been told that it must first implement the mitigation project. TG could not comment in detail on schemes in Fordingbridge as he is relatively new in role. Parish and Town Councils have been accumulating CIL and the NFDC wants to work with those councils regarding how that CIL money is used. The NFDC has been receiving CIL funds for five or six year although the level of receipts early on was low. There is now a new council 17 days into its administration, which will have to identify the projects it wants to pursue. The Town Council and residents should have conversations with their ward councillors regarding projects. TG cannot say how long it will be before the NFDC has a CIL governance framework as it has, to date, had to spend CIL funds mitigating to provide facilities outside the National Park.

TG was asked why such a large percentage of housing had been allocated to Fordingbridge as the town is poorly connected (no cycle routes, a poor bus service so residents have to use cars). TG advised that the sites have already been allocated. Planning is complicated and many factors have to be taken into account, however there are no longer any perfect sites for development. It was suggested to TG that the Local Plan allocated sites to Fordingbridge to meet the employment needs of Salisbury, Southampton and Bournemouth. TG advised it was not employment needs, but housing market needs. TG was asked about the Local Plan review, the Local Plan Part 2 and whether further smaller sites would be allocated to Fordingbridge. TG advised that Part 2 should have been in place by now but it has not been progressed due to changing government plans. It would now be for new members to decide how to progress the Local Plan. There are currently no detailed policy plans, so it would be for new members to decide if the NFDC progresses Part 2. The Local Plan has to be reviewed in five years [within 5 years]. TG was asked about economic development in Fordingbridge. TG could not recall the detail in Fordingbridge. He cited the provision of an employment space in Ringwood but advised that the NFDC had to consider whether there was a need. Covid had an effect on work places. A new Local Plan would need to consider what the future work place looks like.

Cllr Millar (Town and District) told the meeting that, when he was knocking on doors in the run up to the election, there were three things that were consistently raised (i) new homes were necessary but the issue was affordability, (ii) the infrastructure (roads and amenities) does not support the development and (iii) with regard to SS16, the general feeling was it was not an appropriate site and the details of the proposed development had changed to make money for developers.

SB advised that policy makers set out a range of policy documents and it is for the planning officers to then interpret those policies. SB's job is to try and make the best of allocations, with trees, affordable housing, contributions to schools, sustainable travel (opening up footpaths) and making currently private land accessible for everyone. There were no footpaths on SS16 or SS18 and the footpaths on SS17 were narrowly constricted by landowners. SB is looking to open up areas across all the sites for the whole town. SB's background is in conservation. Looking at the three sites, they were allocated by the NFDC because the government had said the NFDC had to allocate sites in its area. The Local Plan sites are allocated but people generally do not take notice until applications come in on the sites. SB has to look past the fact that the site have been allocated and take a positive approach to shape applications to something that looks good and provides housing. He said the NFDC (unlike other planning authorities) has an ecologist, an urban design officer and a conservation officer, all of whom have input on the applications. The schemes when first presented to the NFDC by developers are not what residents see by the time it comes to application stage. SB's job at the start of the process is to try and bring the numbers down towards the number of dwellings set out in the Local Plan, so he has to come up with a compromise solution. Tinkers Cross had an allocation of 30-40 houses in the Local Plan, in the pre-application stage, the developers were looking for over 100 dwellings and he negotiated over 18 months bringing the number of house son site down to 64. However, with less houses on site, there is less affordable housing. The NFDC's target for affordable housing was 50% but at that time there had been no consideration of phosphates going into the Avon. The policy on phosphates now is that developments should have a neutral impact. SS18 has 404 units so the cost to mitigate phosphates is likely to be £3-4m. These additional costs eat into the profits of the site. It is expected that a development should provide a 17-20% return. SB is trying to make the best of the sites but he can only push the developers so far. If he goes beyond that the risk is the developer appeals and wins and the town ends up with a worse scheme. It is difficult but SB is trying to improve the design quality of the schemes.

SB was asked about phosphate mitigation and advised taking the Bickton fish farm out of commission provided phosphate mitigation (details of the scheme are available online). Phosphates are the issue in the Avon and are more difficult to address than nitrates. Nitrates are the issue on the Solent and farms on the Isle of Wight are being taken out to offset nitrates. SB said a lot of phosphates from the farm go into the Avon, shutting the farm generates credits which can be used to mitigate development. The NFDC monitor the credits and when developers purchase credits the NFDC updates its records. The phosphate mitigation scheme stabilises the

phosphate position in the Avon but it is for the water companies to improve the water quality. Wessex Water has a capital investment plan, which includes plans to improve the sewage works in Fordingbridge. The Bickton farm scheme has generated enough credits for the proposed development in both Fordingbridge and Ringwood. It was suggested that selling the credits would pay for the costs of the scheme to the developer. SB said that there was a cost to the developer if it was unable to sell them to someone else. Phosphate mitigation schemes have been slow in gestation, this is currently the only scheme but the value of the scheme is driven by markets so it could change if other schemes are developed and there is competition.

When looking at applications, SB has to balance the competing demands of consultees and residents. He has read all of the objections to SS16 and has to balance these and come up with a recommendation for a scheme that can then go to the elected representatives, so he has to get the best scheme to the committee. SB was asked about sustainability, as set out in the NPPF, and if there was a point where a scheme is deemed not viable. SB said there is no clear definition of sustainability, the views of planning officers and the committee is subjective. SB knew there was a lack of employment opportunities but cannot stand in the way of policy. There is employment in other allocated sites.

SB was asked about infrastructure and said that he can only require contributions to infrastructure where the legislation allows it. He is allowed to for schools but not for doctors surgeries, which are market driven businesses.

SB summarised the ownership of the three sites. SS18 is 80% owned by Pennyfarthing or they have options on the land, the same is true for SS17 and Cala Homes has control of SS16. The development principle for SS16 has been established. Michael Gove has not said the Local Plan will go away. The principle of development has been established on all three strategic sites.

SB showed the concept master plan for SS16. The NPPF says that if there are good reasons to set aside policy then you can, so if the site is not viable due to monetary constraints then you have to consider moving from policy (e.g. a requirement for 50% social housing). The concept master plan is not set in stone. The original application for SS16 was for 240 dwellings, now CALA has put in for 206 dwellings. SB thinks this is still too many houses, he does not just accept a scheme, he scrutinises it and asks the developer to change its plans. He is writing to the developer before the end of the month setting out all of the issues that it needs to resolve. The CALA proposal complies generally with the concept master plan. SB needs to consider critically every house. One issue on the site has already been resolved: the previous proposed access point has been removed as it would have involved the loss of a number of trees and instead access is through the entrance to the nursing home, so no trees are lost. The housing design is good but SB still feels there are too many houses. At present CALA are offering 25% affordable housing but if the number of houses reduce then there will be a loss of affordable housing. There has to be a balancing of housing and ecology needs. SB was asked about the Cranborne AONB and said the key issue is not visibility but the impact on the dark skies, which needs to be considered. In the proposed scheme the roads are not adopted by HCC but by a management company, which means that the owners have more say in the street lighting and there could be less street lighting (e.g. bollard lights, not street lights). SS18 also has lighting issues in relation to the National Park regarding the roundabout on the A338. Occasionally SB comes into conflict with the views of HCC Highways, for example when he wanted chicanes to slow traffic.

Regarding SS16, a detailed application has been submitted and SB is going back to the developers raising a range of issues he has with the application. SB was asked about the construction traffic for SS16. SB said that he had to consult HCC, which has a range of experts who assess the volumes of traffic. Local residents often do not agree with HCC's assessment but HCC looks dispassionately at trip generation and capacity. SB has to consider what Highways are saying. Highways have responded to the application and have raised objections. Highways has raised issues regarding the developers modelling. They also have to consider a construction management plan, which will be a condition of any development. Concerns were raised re vibration of construction traffic and the narrow pavements in the High Street and on Station Road. SB said

that these issues were not unique to Fordingbridge. The same issues arise in other historic towns. He encourages HCC Highways to read and consider the objections of local residents.

Regarding SS17 there is an application for Tinkers Cross where approval has been given for the erection of 64 dwellings. There is separately an application for the remainder of the site, where there is a concept master plan and details of a roundabout on Whitsbury Road, where there is approval of the scheme subject to a legal agreement. The green space on the site will all be available to the public, increasing the amount of land for recreation. The Tinkers Cross site is likely to be completed in Autumn 2024. Originally on SS17 the developers had proposed frontage on Whitsbury Road but SB negotiated that it be set back from the road, pushing developers to get the best outcome. SB thinks the first stage of the development of this site will be better than Augustus Park. There was government policy in relation to sustainable homes that by 2026 all new houses would be carbon neutral, however, developers lobbied and the plans were shelved. SB has to be bound by government planning policy of the day. The government said use building regulations to make the fabric of buildings better, for example through better insulation. SB welcomes the proposed Climate Change SPD, as this can then be used as a planning consideration when considering future development. CALA Homes does have air source heat pumps on its proposed development.

The outline plan on the remainder of SS17 is a good example of the cost of development, where the costs of a roundabout, bridge and 500m of road with no housing has to be borne. Government policy says that there is a presumption that the site is sustainable as it is on the edge of an existing settlement. SB was asked about the call for sites and the movement of settlement boundaries and whether there was a point that the planning authority would say it is not acceptable. Pennyfarthing had options on these sites before it was clear the settlement boundaries had moved. SB advised that this is what developers do. As part of the development of the Local Plan, there is a call for sites and if the developers want to put forward these sites then they can do so. Only sites that are considered deliverable or developable can be included in the Local Plan (some site may not be). TG said that some landowners with land on the edge of a town may take the land to the planning authority. However this is not common, so typically developers approach these landowners and say they will promote the land and if it is included in the Local Plan they will buy it from the landowner. The NFDC get involved at the point it calls for sites. The NFDC wants to know what land is being promoted. No decisions are made on the site at that point, the NFDC then undertakes its own work to identify the promoted sites with merit. It produced a draft of the Local Plan and asks the community for its views. Judgment is made on the suitability of sites as part of the process of developing a Local Plan. There was a sustainability appraisal, a document that is available to consider and a decision on the Local Plan was then made by full council at the NFDC to pass the plan on the planning inspectorate, which deemed the plan sound. The planning authority has to make difficult judgments, TG cited an example where a hamlet went from 400 to 1400 dwellings, but it is then for the planning authority to mitigate the impact, which is the work that SB is undertaking. It is nice to get some of the land into public use. SB said that the Local Plan always envisaged taking traffic via the roundabout on Whitsbury Road through Augustus Park and across to Burgate. It was envisaged that the development would happen to the north of the town due to the geographical constraints of having the National Park to the west and the river to the south of the town.

SB referred to the concept master plan on SS18, where it was envisaged that the development would be away from the Glasshouse Studios but at the time the issues regarding overland surface water flooding had not been appreciated. The application on the sites is now different and frees up land in the centre of the site, the benefit being more usable open space, accessed via a network of raised paths. There are a number of applications on SS18, the first being from Metis Homes on land north of Burgate School, where the NFDC has taken funds from the developer to improve facilities. These funds will be used for formal playing surfaces, a new all weather pitch and Pavilion at Burgate School, which can be used by others outside of school times. In the concept master plan there was a formal pitch at the north of SS18. Similarly there was a formal pitch on SS16 accessible from Marl Lane on the concept master plan. SB did not think these were appropriate and is an example of where the planning authority can ask for a contribution instead. In

all there is likely to £1m to be collected, some of which will go to Burgate School (60% of the school's project is being funded by the Football Foundation). Of the money left over, the Town Council could ask for it to be used at the Recreation Ground. The Town Council can come forward with a project to access those funds. The school will be making the facilities available to the public. The public would have to pay to use the facilities as the all weather surface has to be replaced every 5 to 7 years at a cost of £250k, so charging would make it sustainable. The NFDC are looking at there being a supermarket on SS18 (an example of trying to make the site sustainable) albeit ultimately this is market driven and also a community centre. All trees are being retained on the Metis site, an example of good development, and there are no trees on the Pennyfarthing site but the NFDC are asking the developer to plant some. On the Pennyfarthing application on SS18 it is a hybrid application with the first 112 dwellings being detailed. The NFDC has now received the detailed application for the bypass road. Pennyfarthing are looking to build the road early on as the road has to be completed prior to the 59th dwelling on the site being occupied. Work on the road is likely to start this summer and will take two years to build. Thereafter, construction traffic on the sites can get access using this road. The NFDC pushed for the access road, but economics play a part and the cost of the road depresses the amount of affordable housing. The principle of the road has already been agreed and SB would urge people to have a look at the detail. It includes a cycle lane to the A338, which could then hopefully take users on to the Breamore path. The developers are required to pay a £100k contribution to improve the path from the A338 to Tinkers Cross, the path down to the primary school will also be improved and the NFDC are asking the developers to fill in the potholes on Puddleslosh Lane. The 59th dwelling is the backstop for the road to be built, so the road may be completed before this. In the meantime, Pennyfarthing are in discussion with Brian Currie to use the middle Burgate access as a construction route. For construction on SS17 access would be on the new road and through Augustus Park. SB told the meeting that the Metis Homes site is a success story, where the standard is good, the TPO's have been retained, there is a dog exercise area and safe walking and cycling routes to the school. On the Middle Burgate site, the NFDC is working on amended plans with Brian Currie. The scheme has some unusual styles of houses to make it locally distinctive (e.g. railway architecture), with large areas of public open space that links to the Pennyfarthing public open space. SB hoped that the talk provided an insight into the scale of development and issues faced.

TG concluded by saying that he and SB were happy for the presentation to be circulated and that both their contact details were include in the presentation.

4. To receive the Annual Report from the Town Mayor

The Mayor gave the following report.

Firstly welcome to Fordingbridge Town Hall & many thanks to you all for attending this evenings Annual Town Assembly of the Fordingbridge Town Council. A particularly memorable occasion being the first of these meetings under the reign of King Charles III.

The Fordingbridge Town Council has this month been chosen by the local community to serve the town for the next four years following the local elections. There are several new Councillors now in place & we are looking forward to serving the Town as a team over the next term of office. I am also very privileged to have now taken the position of Mayor for the next year.

There is a considerable amount of change happening in Fordingbridge with regard to on-going housing development & the knock-on effect this has. We as a Town Council are determined to look at all these changes with the best interest of our community in mind & seek to improve infrastructure, highways & other aspects of Town life through positive communications with NFDC & HCC wherever we can.

We are looking at making improvements at the Recreation Ground to further enhance the jewel in Fordingbridge's Crown & make this an even more viable attraction to both locals & visitors alike. The old redundant toilet block & youth shelter are being removed & hopefully these spaces will then be put to better use. In turn these improvements will help attract even more people here &

hopefully bring additional footfall along our High Street to help local businesses continue to trade productively.

The importance of keeping sport available & local to Fordingbridge is also a top priority on the fantastic pitches at the Rec with both the excellent Rugby Club & Hampshire's oldest known football club the Turks providing opportunity to players of all ages & ability.

Whilst on the topic of the Recreation Ground a small event was recently held to celebrate its 100 year anniversary which was again well attended. With the help of Burgate School 100 metres of new hedging was planted at the park to help mark the moment as well as the provision of a new bench by the Town Council to commemorate this significant bit of local history.

Over the past year Fordingbridge Town Council has forged a positive connection with the Fordingbridge Events Group & Fordingbridge Rotary Club. This relationship has seen two fantastic community events held at the Recreation Ground for HM The Queens Platinum Jubilee & most recently the celebration of the Kings Coronation. Both were truly memorable occasions & a great indication of what Fordingbridge is all about & has to offer its community.

The Christmas Lights event is continuing to prove successful & as a Council we are supportive towards helping make the town as attractive as possible over the festive season.

The Annual Christmas Afternoon Tea was provided in the Town Hall and was well attended.

We also saw members of the Town Council and many other local organisations formed recently to try to tackle the cost of living crisis. Several "warm spaces" were opened around the town for the benefit of local residents.

Following the very sad loss of HM Queen Elizabeth II last year the Town Council marked this moment in history with the opening of a book of condolences that was available to be signed by all at the Town Hall over several days.

We also have also sadly lost two long serving members & friends of Fordingbridge Town Council during the last year. Councillor David Price & Councillor Malcolm Adams who both gave up their own time for the benefit of the Town for many years. They will be missed.

The 40th anniversary of the Towns twining with Vimoutiers was celebrated with the Mayor Anna Wilson attending an event in France to mark this notable occasion.

During the last 12 months a community orchard has been planted within Sweatford Water meadow as a joint project between the Town Council & Burgate School

I would like to express my personal thanks & gratitude to the staff at the Tourist Information office, the ground staff over at the Recreation Ground who keep this lovely area looking good all year round & to our finance officer Martine for maintaining all the Council budgets & accounts throughout the year. Special thanks to both the Town Clerk & the Assistant Town Clerk for all the support & hard work they provide to members of the Town Council throughout the year. Finally a big thankyou to Councillor Anna Wilson for all the time & effort she has given during her period as Mayor & Chair of the Fordingbridge Town Council during the past year & to the Deputy Mayor Pat Earth.

Fordingbridge is & always has been 'Our Town' & hopefully we can all continue to work together to make sure it remains the amazing place it truly is for both current & future generations to continue to enjoy & be proud of.

5. To report on finances for 2021/22 (un-audited accounts) and the budget for 22/23.

Fordingbridge Annual Town Assembly 01.06.22

The RFO read the finance report to the meeting (Appendix 1). She noted that the Town Council has £5000 to award as grants under the S137 funding but last year only allocated £1400 of this money. She invited more grant applications.

There were no questions.

6. To receive any matters raised by members of the public.

None

7. To receive any other relevant parish business

Nothing further to report.

The Mayor, Cllr White, thanked everyone for attending. The meeting closed at 9.26pm.

APPENDIX

Report on finances for 2021/22 (un-audited accounts)

Income

For 2021/22 the Town Council received a precept of £261897, this represented a 2.98% increase to meet the increasing costs of wages and utilities.

In 2021/22 the Council received additional income of approximately £114177 (£60K down from the previous year, primarily due to no further COVID grants and £40k less in S106 funding). This includes lengthsman income (£13200), burial fees (£11640), allotments (£2364), S106 funds (£37107), CIL funding (£5333), hall lettings (£2898), recreation ground fees (£8138), hanging basket fees (£2979), fishing fees (£506), lease income (£7500), information office income/map/leaflet sales (£12988) and sundry income/donations (£6654).

Expenditure

During the year the main expenditure items of note relate to the changing room refurbishment (£127755 to be partly met using CIL and S106 funds); replacing the fence and repairing the car park at the recreation ground (£9350); repairs to the paddling pool (£5182) and a new shed for the community allotment plot (£1000).

The Council continued to support the Christmas Lights and the Hanging Baskets/Floral Displays. The new CIL funds will be transferred to reserves where it is ring-fenced until agreement has been reached for their use. During the financial year a grant from these CIL funds was made to Avonway Community Centre of £10000 towards the replacement roof.

The forecast year end position (taking into account the use of reserves and S106 funds noted above) will be an overspend of £20000, to be transferred from the general reserves held by the Council.

S137 Grants

The Council have a budget of £5000 for S137 grants, during 2021/22 £1400 was allocated (compared with £2472 in 2020/21) – this is primarily due to a low level of applications from local groups.

New Forest CAB	£350.00
Hope for Tomorrow	£700.00
Little Buds	£250.00
Victim Support	£100.00
Total	£1400.00

Budget for 2022/23

For 2022/23 the Town Council requested a precept of £285144.

	Council Tax Requirement	Tax Base	Council Tax per Band D
2021/22	£261987	2353.20	£111.29
2022/23	£285144	2413.30	£118.16
Increase	£23247	60.10	£6.86

Members are attempting to balance the increasing costs facing the Town Council due to above inflation rises in utility costs and an increase in the population due to local housing developments. The increase per Band D property has been limited to £6.86 over the year.

The full accounts will be available for inspection once the internal audit has inspected them – please contact the office for more information.

*Martine Coatham, Responsible Financial Officer
May 2022*