**Birdham Parish Council**

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Parish Council**

**held on Monday 17th September 2018**

**at 7pm in Birdham Village Hall**

**Present**: Cllr Pocock (Chairman) Cllrs Glover, Richardson, Campbell and Firmston.

**Apologies**: Cllrs Hamilton (Vice Chairman), Churchill, Bird, and Cllr Montyn (WSCC).

**In attendance**: The Clerk, Cllr Barrett (CDC) and 10 members of the public.

**40-18 Declaration of Interests:**

1. Cllr Glover a personal interest in planning application BI/18/01983/FUL.
2. There were none.

**41-18 Approve and sign the minutes of the 16th July 2018:**

**It was resolved** to adopt the minutes of the 16th July 2018 as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

**42-18 Public Question time from residents of Birdham in accordance with Standing Orders 1d -1l:**

A resident was concerned that should planning application BI/18/01651/FUL is granted then considerable amounts of both disabled parking would be lost as would access.

The chairman said that a condition could be requested to counter a reduction in either access or parking.

**43-18 Planning matters including applications and CDC delegated decisions:**

1. **Planning Applications to be decided.**

BI/18/01651/FUL - Birdham Pool Marina the Causeway Birdham

The installation of infrastructure and associated engineering works to accommodate 9 houseboats to be used as holiday homes only, including the erection of a raised walkway, moorings and associated car parking.

**Review & Ratification of decision made and submitted – Attached at annex a. and b.**

BI/18/02026/OBG - (Martin Grant Homes) Rowan Nursery and Pippins Bell Lane Birdham

Variation of a S106 agreement for BI/17/00316/FUL.

Birdham Parish Council raises **No Objection** to this application

BI/18/02049/ADV - Birdham Pool The Causeway Birdham

1 no. non-illuminated freestanding entrance sign.

The Parish Council **Objects** to this application as it considers the introduction of yet another sign within the AONB as a further intrusion into the visual amenity of the area.

BI/18/01972/DOM - Field Cottage Westlands Estate Birdham

Proposed outbuilding - car/boat store with ancillary accommodation in loft. Variation of condition 3 of planning permission 18/00230/DOM - cladding detail and additional door and window to east elevation.

Birdham Parish Council raise **No Objection** to this application but would request that a

condition is imposed preventing occupation of the building or disposal of the building seperate to the main dwelling.

BI/18/01983/FUL - Yendor Farm Hundredsteddle Lane Birdham

Demolition of buildings and replacement with 4no. mobile holiday homes.

The Parish Council **Objects** to this application on the following grounds;

Access - access is extremely limited via a single track lane that is not in the best of condition.

Drainage - Whilst it is acknowledged that the area does not show on the flood map as prone to flooding, locally it is a known fact that during the winter months or periods of prolonged or heavy

rain the area is prone to flooding.

Should CDC be minded to grant permission the Parish Council would request that a seasonal condition be imposed with no occupation during the months of November/December

BI/18/02121/DOM - 32 Florence Close Birdham

Demolish existing conservatory and replace with single storey garden room extension.

The Parish Council raises **No Objection** to this application

BI/18/02088/TPA - 26 Walwyn Close Birdham

Reduce eastern sectors by 2.5m (back to previous wound points), remove epicormic growth and deadwood on 2 no. Oak trees (T5 and T6) subject to BI/97/00037/TPO.

The Parish Council are content to defer the decision to the CDC Tree Officer

BI/18/02204/ELD - Kellys Farm Bell Lane Birdham

Existing lawful development use of building as a Dwelling.

Generally the Parish Council **do not object** to this application as they are unable to determine the accuracy of the previously submitted evidence.

BI/18/02217/FUL - Chaffinches Farm Main Road Birdham

Erection of a domestic storage barn forming an extension to an existing barn.

The Parish Council raises **No Objection** to this application but, would request that a condition is

imposed preventing the seperation of the barn from the main dwelling place for the purposes of a dwelling place or holiday home.

BI/18/02130/FUL Plot 13 Land South West Of Premier Business Park Birdham Road

Resubmission of BI/17/01383/FUL submitted 30.5.2017 and refused 03.10.2017 for a change of use of the land for a single pitch for Gypsy occupation comprising touring caravan, hard standing and provision of static mobile home with facilitating development (hard standing, fencing, oil tank, cess tank)-(retrospective).

Birdham Parish Council **strongly objects** to this application on the following grounds;

This site falls within Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and outside the

Settlement Policy Area of Birdham.

Planning policies covering these applications would include the NPPF, the Chichester District

Local Plan, the Birdham Neighbourhood Plan, and the Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Management Plan.

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 11b of the National Planning Policy Framework requires presumption in favour of

sustainable development, except where specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted. Note 6 specifically indicates this to mean AONBs. In the Parish Councils opinion this proposal will do material harm to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB thus failing Paras 170 and 172.

Chichester Local Plan:

Virtually none of the requirements of Policies 43 (Chichester Harbour AONB), 45 (Development in the Countryside) and 48 (Natural Environment) of the Chichester Local Plan:

In addition, Policy 36 (Planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople) has 6 criteria, all of which have to be met. This site fails to meet criteria 1 to 4 of this policy.

Also, the Gypsy & Traveller & Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment. This

assessment provides a map of potential broad locations for sites to meet the assessed needs.

Birdham is not included as a suitable broad area.

Birdhams Neighbourhood; Birdham has one settled Gypsy site. There was no requirement in the Local Plan to provide further sites.

This application does not meet the requirements of the following policies:

Policy 4 - Landscape Character -the open views across the heritage landscape and agricultural

heritage on either side of Lock Lane, Court Barn Lane and to the north & south of Birdham Straight

Policy 9- Transport impact must be mitigated via developer contributions

Policy 13 - Settlement Boundary. Outside of the Settlement Boundary Area, development will only be permitted where it complies with policy 15 of this Plan and policy 45 in the Chichester Local Plan or any future version of that policy.

Policy 15 - Rural Area Policy Development will be in accordance with the NPPF paragraph 55, the Chichester Local Plan policy 45.

Chichester Harbour Conservancy Management Plan

The Harbour Conservancy will speak for itself regarding this policy document.

This application therefore does not meet the terms of the Chichester District Local Plan , or

Birdhams Neighbourhood Plan.

Additionally, an application to build 5 houses in the adjoining field (B1/12/03671) was refused

recently. Reasons given were that the harm to the AONB was not justified by the Districts need for houses.

Birdham Parish Council therefore **strongly object** to this application, and requests that planning permission should be refused.

BI/18/02257/DOM - Little Orchard , 4 Burlow Close, Birdham

Change use of garage to habitable accommodation. Build new single storey garage with pitched roof on to front of house. Widen existing front dormers. Install Velux window in rear roof. Replace existing paving on front elevation.

The Parish Council **Objects** to this application. It would appear that the 'NEW' single story garage is in fact not a garage but an addition internal room. In addition this element of the application destroys the building line of a row of buildings within Burlow Close.

BI/18/02286/TPA - Pict Fenn , Court Barn Road, Birdham,

Fell 6 no. Holm Oak trees. (T2, T3, T4, T5, T7 and T8) subject to BI/00040/TPO.

The Parish Council are content to defer the decision to the CDC Tree Office

**It was resolved** to authorise the Clerk to notify the Councils decisions to CDC Planning.

**Delegated Decisions to be noted.**

BI/18/01105/DOM Hammonds Farm Westlands Lane Birdham

Replacement part of the East Boundary wall. **PERMIT**

BI/18/00230/DOM Field Cottage Westlands Estate Birdham

Proposed outbuilding - car/boat store with ancillary accommodation in loft. **PERMIT**

BI/18/01014/FUL Chaffinches Farm Main Road Birdham

Erection of a domestic storage barn with gravel hard standing following the removal of an existing equestrian fenced riding arena. **REFUSE**

BI/18/01375/DOM Dove House Church Lane Birdham

Single storey front extension to garage. **PERMIT**

BI/18/01162/DOM 33 Longmeadow Gardens Birdham

Single storey rear extension (south elevation). **PERMIT**

BI/18/01679/DOM Cross Trees Burlow Close Birdham

Change garage into habitable accommodation with new pitched roof and external alterations. **PERMIT**

BI/17/03655/FUL Whitestone Farm Main Road Birdham

Change of use from antiques shop and gallery with workshop, to art studio/workshop, art education centre and gallery. **PERMIT**

BI/18/01780/DOM Skylarks Pescotts Close Birdham

Garage extension. (Variation of condition 2 from planning permission 17/03016/DOM to lower the roof pitch and to change the roofing material.) **PERMIT**

**44-18 Clerks’ Report:**

1. **WSCC** – There was nothing to report.
2. **CDC** – The Clerk reported that he had received the following information from CDC;

* Notification of the appeal against the refusal of application BI/16/00933/OUT

to take place between the 2nd and 5th October at the Vicars Hall Chichester commencing at 10:00am.

* Notification of enforcement notices BI/35, BI/36 and BI/37 against Land at Plots 12, 13 and 14 Land at North West of Premier Business Park.
* Notification of enforcement notice BI/40 against land at Little Oak Farm, Land North of Cowdry Nursery, Sidlesham Lane.

1. **Reports from Members of WSCC/CDC –** In giving his apologies Cllr Montyn asked that the information below and a more detailed explanation be passed on as follows;

*‘In a letter to County Councillors the West Sussex County Council Leader has yesterday (5th September) provided details of the current forecast spending and funding position for the next four years for West Sussex Council.*

*At previous Parish Council meetings I have referred to the budget pressures facing the County Council every year.*

*While the Government continues to make further year on year savings and unavoidable upward Council budget pressures arise, the task of achieving a balanced County Council budget is becoming more and more difficult.*

*As you are likely to be hearing and reading about this in the coming months, I felt I should share this information available today with you.*

*I attach a shortened version of the Council Leader’s current forecast position-but which still includes the essentials- for your information (this document may be found at annex c.)*

*In the coming months leading up to the February Council meeting where next year’s Council budget will be debated, I will be able to give more details of the proposed portfolio savings as these emerge from the relevant Select Committees.’*

Cllr Barrett reported that there was some concern about the funding of the Manhood Peninsula Forum and the effect it would have if the Forum was to fade away. He went on to say that eleven questions had been asked about the Local Plan and they had left the meeting unanswered which was extremely disappointing. He had now been allocated a meeting with our MP on the 16th November in an attempt to get the answers needed.

He asked if the Parish Council was receiving the Monthly Bulletin from CDC and reminded the Council that a planning application was coming to the CDC Planning Committee this week for 85 homes on the old site of the holiday camp at Bracklesham and he hoped that Birdham would be represented as there would be an impact on the village.

The Chairman said that it had been his intention to attend and asked permission from the Council to do so in an official capacity and that he would be speaking against the proposal.

Permission was granted by the Council for Cllr Pocock to represent the Council at the Planning Committee.

1. **Other related matters –** There no other related matters to report.

**45-18 Finance and Corporate:**

1. **To receive and approve the financial report.**

The Clerk presented the financial report up to and including the 16th July 2018 shown at Annex d. The current balances are as follows;

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Balances held at Bank as at 1st April 2017 | £ 36967.81 |
| Designated Funds | £ 29654.17 |
| Ring Fenced Funds | £ 7850.00 |
| Available Funds | £ 28686.83 |
| Creditors | £ 2906.13 |

The Clerk reported that the second tranche of the precept of £23953.00 had been received and then offered to answer any questions that Councillors may have.

**It was resolved** to adopt the Financial Report.

1. To review and decide on the offer by the MWHG to carry out the maintenance of the three ponds within the remit of the Parish Council as per the example at annex b to the agenda.

The Chairman briefly explained the reasoning behind this proposal but as the documentation had already been circulated he asked if there were any comments from Councillors.

All Councillors considered that this was the way forward and authorised Cllr Firmston and the Clerk to meet with the MWHG to work out the methods to be used.

1. The Clerk reminded all Councillors of his upcoming absence on leave from the 25th of September to the 8th October and that he had arranged for a Locum to act in his sted should it be required. However, he went on to say that he would be available via email or ‘phone should in the case of an emergency. He also undertook to circulate the Locums contact details.
2. The Clerk went on to report that he had received an email from a resident requesting support for a commemorative event for those who perished in World War 1. Support was required in order for a grant of £250.00 to be made from the CDC. It was put to the vote and which authorised the Clerk to apply for the grant which should then be made available to the residents organising the event.

**46-18 Correspondence – Not previously circulated: -**

The Clerk reported that the CPRE magazine and the NALC magazine had been received and passed on.

**47-18** **Reports**:

1. **Play Area and Playing Field**. – The Clerk said that he had submitted the application to CDC for NHB Grants to replace the gates in the Play Area which are continually being damaged.

Cllr Firmston said that he still working on getting the clearance from CDC Planning and the necessary quotations to both collect the donated wood and build the footbridges

1. **Village Green and Pond and Condition of Village Ditch/Drain Network.** – The Clerk reported that he had contacted contractors from the list supplied by WSCC in order to get works done under an Op Watershed arrangement. Of the three firms requested to quote one only had responded which was Landbuild. Landbuild had provided quote for two of the projects, being the Salterns and the Western Drain, but they had not quoted on the Dingles project because of issues with residents. A workaround was in the process of being developed and elements of the other two were being checked out as potentially a highways responsibility. At the moment all that we can do is wait.
2. **Communication Working Groups.** – It is anticipated that the next Newsletter will be published in November.
3. **Community Resilience. –** Cllr Firmston said that all of the equipment had now been marked and was stored in the Village Hall. He went on to say that there are a number of items such as radios, batteries and the like that needed to be purchased and asked if it was possible for the Council to do so.

The Clerk suggested that any funding could come from the reserve with the proviso that at the next budget round it could be cleared. It was put to the vote and resolved to adopt the Clerks suggestion.

**48-18 Reports of meetings attended by Councillors; -**

There were none.

**49-18 Items for inclusion on the next agenda:**

There were none.

**50-18 Date of Next Meeting:**

**The next meeting of the Parish Council will be held on the**

**15th October 2018 at 7pm in Birdham Village Hall**

There being no further business to discuss the meeting was declared closed at 8.55pm

Signed \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Dated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chairman

**Annex a.**

**Birdham Parish Council response to Planning Application BI/18/01651/FUL**

Birdham Parish Council most strongly objects to this planning application. It is outside of the Settlement Policy Area defined in our made Neighbourhood Plan, is within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which by Act of Parliament is afforded the same level of protection as a National Park.

In coming to this unified position, we have considered the Inspectors comments in the following planning appeals.

* Church Lane APP/L3815/A/13/2208162
* Birdham Farm APP/L3815/C/15/3065780

**Context into which this application seeks permission to develop.**

This application seeks permission to develop the ancient Birdham Causeway.

Birdham appears as Brideham in the Domesday Book of 1086, which also records the presence of a mill. Until 1768 the causeway was part of the main road from the Wittering’s running along Crooked Lane, Court Barn Lane, the Causeway, Lock Lane north to Chichester. The present Birdham Mill, dates from 1768.

The Causeway forms the southeast boundary of Birdham Marina. The marina was developed in 1935, with some build during WW2 to support the manufacture of landing craft.

In it landscape assessment the developer attempts to link the pool to the marina basin, but this is not the case. This part of the pool has never been developed.

**Importance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty**

Chichester Harbour AONB is a critical local asset of national importance. This proposed development will detract from the asset value.

In formulating the Neighbourhood Plan residents were surveyed to which features of the area they thought were important. The results confirmed that the AONB is a significant asset,

and along with nationally listed buildings, Birdham Pool and the Pond are listed first in Policy 1 of **B**irdham **N**eighbourhood **P**lan.

In the Church Lane Appeal the Appellants Landscape Witness attempted to argue that the important part of the AONB was the area contained within the High-water mark, which incidentally defines the RAMSAR site, and as such the AONB washed over the village, but later conceded that the land is equally important to the healthy ecological environment.

**It is noted that not once in the Applicants Design and Access Statement** **is the word AONB mentioned.**

We therefore believe that this application fails **Policy 1** of Birdham Neighbourhood Plan. It also fails to take account of Para14 of the 2012 NPPF as well as note 6 of Para 11 of the NPPF released July 2018.

We would like to remind members of the Planning committee NPPF 2012 para 14-d-1 (NPPF 2018 11-d-1) states ‘*the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed.’*

**Harm to the Landscape.**

Before the Inspector in the case of Church Lane the Appellants Landscape Witness admitted that any development caused considerable harm to that land on which the development was taking place, but he argued that damage could be mitigated by the addition of screening, thus minimising the effect on the landscape. Similar arguments were made by the Appellant in the recent appeal at Birdham Farm. In both cases the inspectors concluded that both developments would cause significant harm to the Landscape and was not off-set by screening.

It is significant that in this case the Applicants say, ‘*The surrounding area of open countryside and fringe areas of the site are abundantly populated with foliage, as such no new planting will be established on site*.’

We would argue that a row of architecturally bland houseboats stretched out and angled as to form a nonstop obstruction to the landscape from the causeway, will rob the village of one of its most important heritage sites. The incorporation of any construction on the south side of the causeway will totally alter the character of this part of the AONB with the enclosure of this road which will result.  The existing character is enhanced due to its totally open nature which construction of any kind to the south of the causeway will alter detrimentally, and therefore must be considered a severe impact on the local landscape, and thus fails Policy 4 of the Birdham Neighbourhood Plan, and certainly fails CHC planning Guidelines which require ‘*'Chichester Harbour Conservancy Design Guidelines state that within the AONB the main purpose of the Planning System is to ensure that any change through development* ***conserves and enhances*** *the natural beauty of the landscape*

**Major Development**

When the then Secretary for State the Right Hon Nick Bowls was asked to define major development, he declined to do so saying this was something for Local Planning authorities, as it would differ from one LPA to the next. In the determination of Birdham Farm the Inspector criticised CDC, Harbour Conservancy and residents for NOT raising the issue of whether that application should be considered a major development, and then went on to develop her own reasons why she considered it was. That view has not been challenged.

**Is this a major development?**

Birdham Parish Council believes it is. With no guidance from NPPF, or the Chichester District Local Plan, we look to the position taken by CDC prior to NPPF, their **Facilitating Appropriate Development**, considered that appropriate development for surrounding villages including Birdham was 25, and that minor development was less than 6. Under those rules we believe this development is major, and as such this application fails to pass any of the tests required in Para 115 & 6 of NPPF 2012, or para 172 of NPPF2018.

**The setting of listed buildings**

 The setting of the listed buildings in the area will be negatively affected by the proposals.

At both Church Lane and Birdham Farm appeals, expert witnesses pointed out that since the ANOB was established there has been little change in Birdham, and this is particularly true around Birdham Marina where, other than refurbishment, the newest buildings date to WW2.

**Housing.**

The current Local Plan sets Birdham’s indicative housing allocation at 50. Currently the number of planning permissions is

* Tawny Nursery 30
* Rowan Nursery 25
* Crooked Lane 15
* Chichester Marina 9+5

Therefore, neither the CDC Local Plan nor the Birdham Neighbourhood Plan requires any further housing to be provided.

NPPF, CDC Local Plan and Birdham Neighbourhood Plan require that all developments supply an element of affordable housing.

This application states

*The Birdham Pools development will create high specification, high quality and unique residential living spaces and as such, will likely attract wealthy buyers who can contribute substantially to the local economy. Based on the socio-economic profile of potential purchasers of the houseboats,*

As such this is this is a residential development.

**Policy 16** also requires that ‘the *density that reflects Birdham’s character as a rural village settlement rather than an urban giving the impression of space with uniform houses and plots being avoided.*’ And later says *‘the design and materials are in keeping with the individual character and distinctiveness of the Parish…’*

This development of cramped featureless monoliths clearly fails our criteria.

Policy 7 of the Neighbourhood Plan covering Integration and Sense of Community states that ‘new residential development must integrate well into the existing community.’ This development is separated from the core centre of Birdham village and all its facilities thus failing Policy 7

**Tourism**

It is suggested that the houseboats are sold as holiday homes – the increase in tourism will be negligible.

**Local Economic Benefits**

 These will be limited as the only work being undertaken locally will be the construction of infrastructure – the houseboats themselves will be brought in by lorry from elsewhere.  The economic benefits are therefore overstated.  It is likely that once the houseboats are sold little benefit to local employment and the economy will exist.

**Biodiversity and Ecology**

The Pool is an SSSI and one of only 11 saline ponds in England (Source Natural England 1996).  The wildlife will be adversely affected.

Three species of bats protected under EU law habit in this area. Daubenton’s and Natter’s (significant colonies), Nathusius pipistrelles (uncommon and rare) all who forage in the inner pool area and it is believed use the Causeway as a navigation route. Structures and increased lighting along with the visual amenity of the natural environment will be irreversibly damaged.

We are concerned that the Ecology Appraisal provided by Dr P Tosswell relies heavily on evidence provided by the application to the North of the Site for works to the Marina. This is despite the obvious difference in the nature of the two areas.  The Marina is a saltwater marina and the pool is a Saline Pool – one has boats which pump out foul water into it the other does not. This comparison is therefore totally irrelevant.  On the basis of no actual empirical evidence to base this report upon, it is our view that it should be disregarded

**Impact on Amenity**

A huge amount of amenity to the local population and visitors alike is provided by the numerous footpaths surrounding this area.  The proposals will damage both the local character and long views of the pool and will undoubtedly have a damaging and negative impact to the amenity.

**Parking**

The areas identified for parking are in many cases already used for that activity.  There will therefore be limited if any additional car parking.  Pressure on parking at the marina is already severe as can be evidenced by the numerous signs stating no parking.  Indeed, some areas which have been identified for car parking are currently used for activities associated with the business of running the marina and the installation of this car parking will have a negative economic effect on the marina.

**Sewage and foul water**

There is no statement on how this would be facilitated, sewage in the main marina is simply flushed out into the marina and the harbour.  This method of sewage and foul water disposal could not happen to the south of the causeway without catastrophic environmental consequences.  No pump out or other sewage facilities exist in Birdham Pool at present (audit of facilities taken from the website).  Considerable unidentified infrastructure would need to be installed to deal with this issue which would further harm the AONB and character of the area.

**Light Pollution and Dark Skies**

This will inevitably be detrimentally affected by these proposals

**Visual Harm to the Landscape.**

In the ‘LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT’ the applicant attempts to link the development to the existing marina. They claim that all views will include some aspects of the marina. This is not true. If you stand in the Causeway and look south-east, you are confronted with a large area of open water, occupied by many different verities of birds/water fowl. This view which the many users of the Salterns Way experience daily will be destroyed.

Likewise, it is claimed that looking in from the surrounding country side towards the marina the development will add to the marina environment. What you will see is a uniform row of featureless houseboats with some masts above. The boats themselves will be completely obscured.

Views in all directions will be adversely affected**. This report is so selective as to be very misleading.**

**Indicative visual elevations**

The Parish Council has included an artists accurate impression of the elevations which can be found at annex b.

Annex b.



**Annex c.**

**Summary**

* The following briefly outlines the County Council’s current forecast financial position for the next four financial years i.e. the period 2019/20 to 2022/23
* Over the next four financial years, the latest estimate budget shortfall is around **£146m**. (note that WSCC has already made £145 million of savings over the last 8 years since 2010.).
* The estimated budget for 2019/20 and while savings plans are being worked up, would at present still leave a gap of around **£22.3m** to be closed to ensure a legally required balanced budget.
* The County Council Cabinet is considering reductions for some discretionary non-statutory services to close this gap
* The forecasts are based on the assumption that no additional Gov’t funding is provided for Adult Social Care or Children Social Care services-the largest County Council revenue budget areas.

**Revenue Forecast**

**Forecast Position**

* Over the next four years, total expenditure is estimated to exceed the available funding by **£146.2m**, before any council tax rise is assumed.
* **2019/20** - after allowing for current savings plans, the County Council still faces a gap of **£22.3m** to deliver a balanced budget. A number of options for closing this gap through reductions for some discretionary non-statutory services have been published in the Forward Plan: these are to be considered this autumn and will be subject to appropriate engagement and consultation.

**Future Funding Position**

* The County Council’s core funding from Government is forecast to reduce by **£13.0m** in 2019/20.
* The County Council additionally faces a loss of **£0.9m** in Public Health Grant and **£0.6m** in support for Troubled Family work as Government reduces funding for this programme.
* The total reduction in WSCC core revenue funding from Government since 2010 has been **£145m**.
* New Homes Bonus (NHB) funding has supported the County Council’s base budget, currently **£4.1m** in 2018/19. The Government has announced a ‘reform’ of the NHB and WSCC now expects this funding to be phased out and cease after 2022/23, which therefore represents a further loss for WSCC’s base budget funding.
* A significant loss to the County Council is predicted from the Government’s **Fair Funding Review**, due to be implemented in 2020/21. The County Council also expects a loss of funding from the reset of the business rates system, losing much of the growth in business rates used to assist the base budget. The eventual loss of funding from Government is estimated as potentially in the £10m-£20m region, though much will depend on how quickly changes are phased in.
* The budget gap estimates above include assumptions for the council tax base (i.e. the number of tax paying households). A 2% tax base rise has been assumed in 2019/20 followed by 1.7% thereafter. If this doesn’t materialise, (e.g. should housebuilding slow because of a recession) the County Council will need to apply reserves or find additional budget cuts.

**Forecast Budget Pressures**

* The current total budget pressure for 2019/20 is **£50.8m** or 9.5% of the Council’s net budget.
* Most of the identified financial pressure is unavoidable as it is linked to the increasing need and the statutory duty to provide services, such as social care and waste disposal.The removal of the1% public sector pay cap and the introduction of the National Living Wage arising in Adults Social Care result in an upward revenue budget pressure.

**Capital Forecast**

* **School Places** There is pressure on capital spending linked to school place provision. Over the longer term with 50-60,000 new houses in West Sussex planned this will lead to a greater demand for places across the school system.  New school places are funded through the DfE Free School process. It these schools do not come forward or are in the wrong part of the country the County Council will need to provide these places through schools Basic Need Grant and/or Section 106 funding. Any shortfall will have to be met by the County Council, increasing strain on the capital programme. The government has already announced that the County Council will not receive any basic need funding in 2020/21.
* **Highways** After DfT grants and Section 106 monies, the County Council needs to fund the remaining costs to deliver the highway works required for housing. In the current capital programme WSCC needs to fund a total of **£23.7m** in contributions from the County Council to deliver the required improvements for the A29, A259, A2300 and A284. Financing these capital costs increases pressure on the revenue budget.

5th September 2018

**Annex d.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | | **Birdham Parish Council** | | | |  |
|  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Financial Statement as at 16th July 2018** | | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  | |  |  | £ |
| Bank Accounts as at 1st April 2018 | | | |  | |  |  | 36967.81 |
| Receipts to date | |  | |  | |  |  | 60526.32 |
| Expenditure to date | |  | |  | |  |  | 28397.00 |
|  |  |  | |  | | **Balance** |  | **69097.13** |
| **Represented by;** | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Current Account (Barclays Community A/c) | | | | | |  |  | 36831.21 |
| Deposit Account (Barclays Premium Business A/c) | | | | | | |  | 25330.27 |
| National Savings | | |  |  | |  |  | 6935.65 |
|  |  | |  |  | | **Total** |  | **69097.13** |
| **Less** |  | |  |  | |  |  |  |
| Reserve @ 50% of Precept | | |  |  | |  |  | 21063.13 |
| Loan Reserve for half year | | |  |  | |  |  | 8591.04 |
| Outstanding Cheque/s - | | |  |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | | **Total** |  | **29654.17** |
| **Ringfenced Funds** | | |  |  | |  |  |  |
| Op Watershed | | |  |  | |  |  |  |
| NHB |  | |  |  | |  |  |  |
| Culvert Maintenance | | |  |  | |  |  | 2300.00 |
| Catchment pond improvement fund | | | |  | |  |  | 4000.00 |
| Adams bequest (Fencing) | |  | |  | |  |  | 1550.00 |
|  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  | | **Total** |  | **7850.00** |
| **Available Funds** | |  | |  | | **Total** |  | **28686.83** |
|  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Signed** | David J Siggs | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
|  | **Clerk to the Council** | | |  | |  |  |  |
|  | **16th July 2018** |  | |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Payments to be considered** | | | |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| B Geary (Litter Picking) | |  | |  | |  |  | 140.00 |
| Clerks Expenses (Telephone, scanning) | | | | | |  |  | 110.25 |
| M H Kennedy & Son Ltd (Grass Cutting) | | | | | |  |  | 302.40 |
| WSCC (Street Lighting Maintenance) | | | | |  |  |  | 967.93 |
| ICO (Data Registration) | |  | | |  |  |  | 40.00 |
| A Dover (Grass & Bus Shelters) | | | | |  |  |  | 274.00 |
| Came & Company (Parish Insurance) | | | | |  |  |  | 1035.55 |
| CPRE (Subscription) | |  | | |  |  |  | 36.00 |
|  |  |  | | |  | **Total** |  | **2906.13** |