



Imogen Whitaker - Clerk & RFO to the Council
2 McAdam Close, Hambrook, PO18 8FG
T: 01243 575094/E: clerk@birdhamparishcouncil.gov.uk
www.birdham.org.uk

Minutes of the Remote Meeting of the Parish Council
held on Monday 21st December 2020
at 7pm

Present:

Cllr Timothy Firmston (Chairman), Cllr Elizabeth Hamilton (Vice-chair)
Cllr Graham Campbell, Cllr Rachel Glover, Cllr Clive Bush, Cllr Laurie Pocock
Cllr Gordon Churchill

In attendance:

The Clerk	WSCC Pieter Montyn
CDC – Cllr Graham Barrett	CDC – Cllr Susan Taylor
4 members of the Public (including representative of Birdham Residents' Association)	
Mr Sam Langmead – landowner	Mr Paul White – Planning Consultant

The Chairman welcomed members and guests to the meeting. The chairman proposed moving Item 7 up the agenda to be dealt with after Item 3.

1. Apologies

None

2. Declarations of interest

- i. Cllr Campbell declared an interest for item 7 - Church Lane development.
- ii. There were no dispensation requests

3. Minutes – to approve and sign the minutes of November 16th 2020.

The minutes were proposed by Cllr Pocock, seconded by Cllr Campbell, and unanimously **AGREED** to be a true and accurate record. They were duly signed by the Chairman.

Item 7 was discussed here

Planning matters including appeals, applications and CDC delegated decisions.

- i. **Notifications of new Planning Enforcement Notices – there were none received**
- ii. **Notifications of Planning Appeals – Appeal APP/L3815/W/19/3237926 Common Piece, Main Road Birdham for placement of static caravan for human habitation – APPEAL DISMISSED.**

- iii. **Updates on Planning Enforcements** – Clerk has received long list from CDC and is working on updating. When completed she will circulate to councillors

Planning applications to be decided:

- iv. Application BI/20/03034/OUT was discussed first:

Land and Buildings on The South Side of Church Lane Birdham West Sussex	Erection of 25 no. dwellings comprising 17 open market and 8 affordable units with access, landscaping open space and associated works
---	--

The chairman invited Mr Paul White, Planning consultant for Mr S Langmead to present the development.

Mr White thanked the meeting for bringing the item forward. He said that he had been passed a copy of the “round robin” letter that had been circulated by the Residents’ Association and would answer some of the points. He felt that there were three issues to be addressed:

- i. The scale of the development
- ii. The AONB policy constraint
- iii. Any other policy considerations such as drainage/nitrates/housing shortfall

The CDC Local Plan review proposed an increase of housing in Birdham up to 125 dwellings. He said that this indicated that CDC felt that Birdham was good for this amount of development despite the AONB constraint. Housing was already situated within the AONB so clearly this was not impossible. He said that another important point was that the developer must prove sustainability – and that the shop, hall, and school were all within the AONB. In the AONB any development must not fall foul of the “Major Development” policy. A previous plan for this site for 46 houses had been dismissed at appeal as it represented a major development. This proposal was not a major development with only 25 houses. He said that some development must be within the AONB as it was the most sustainable part of the village.

With regard to the drainage the development would use Sidlesham Treatment works and not Appledram, and that the nitrates would be discharged to Pagham and not to Chichester Harbour.

The culvert which runs parallel to Cherry Lane would not be affected as it is supposed to take excess rainwater to avoid flooding.

There will also be a pedestrian cycle link on site which would avoid having to use Church Lane.

A member of the public said that this footpath had not been agreed – there was an opening onto Church Lane but no exit.

Mr White said that the access was outlined in the plans, but they would be more than happy for it to be included as a planning condition or as part of S106 considerations. The member of the public asked if an agreement had already been made with the cricket club? If not, then this path was just a theory and as it stood it did not exist.

Mr Langmead said that he had rights of way over this land which were made when he sold the land to the Cricket Club so that this was not an issue.

Cllr Hamilton said that previously the application that had been dismissed had twice the number of dwellings. She said that this new plan had the housing tucked in behind the frontage so that it does not hide any of the AONB views – nor at the front. The cycle/footpath was a very good idea. She said that in the eleven years

she had lived in Birdham she had never seen the field used for anything. She also said that the Sidlesham sewage works were at capacity and not very far above sea level. It only needed an exceptionally high tide for all the sewage to be pumped into Pagham harbour.

Cllr Hamilton said that she would like to propose No Objection to this development on the grounds that there was no problem with the views of AONB; the implementation of the cycle/footpath; it was a good small development within the settlement area. She said that it was not in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) but that did not mean it was not deliverable.

Cllr Pocock said that at the recent (traveller) appeal, the inspector had almost issued a rebuke to CDC and the Harbour Conservancy that they had not argued that 11 caravans was a major development. He said that the starting point for any development in the AONB would have to be that it was in the public interest. There was no public interest here. He continued that every time the same argument was given for what people believed to be the situation with the sewage treatment. As far back as 2013 Southern Water said that “it worked well until it is completely overwhelmed”. In 2014 it was already at 92% capacity, and if the Local Plan houses since then were taken into account it was up to 97%. There was no further capacity on the Manhood because of the water levels.

Cllr Pocock proposed rejection of the application. He said that developers were always looking for ways around planning constraints and putting forward areas that were nothing to do with the Manhood as precedents. He said that if one development were allowed in the AONB, it would be setting a precedent and then the applications would be coming in all the time.

Mr White responded by saying that no precedent would be set by this development as 80% of the housing is already in the AONB. He went on to say that 25 houses do not constitute a major development – and that the inspector when talking of the traveller site would have taken into consideration all the other paraphernalia that comes with the mobile homes.

Another member of the public pointed out that the development proposed in 2011 was not as dense as this one, because much more land was used. In this plan the houses are crammed together around the edge leaving a large space in the middle and another pasture was left unaccounted for.

Mr White said that the density was 12 houses per hectare and that they would like to propose that the Parish adopts the remaining open space. He said that they had made the call that 25 houses do not constitute a major development as the previous application of 46 homes did. He said the onus was also on the developer to abide by CDC’s requirement that an efficient use of land should be made, and that the application does not fall foul of the 2015 appeal plan.

Cllr Pocock responded that in the submission by the developers at the last inquiry they had argued that there had already been development in the AONB. But the Parish Council’s response had been that 99% of the houses built in the AONB had been there before the AONB was designated. He said that the AONB did not “wash across” Birdham, but on the contrary the boundary had been very, very well considered.

Mr White said that they were trying to respect the policies of the AONB, but why would CDC have designated 125 homes if the capacity were full?

Cllr Bush said that the policies in the Local Plan (currently out of date) had allocated 50 homes to Birdham which it needed and could take. The interim preferred

approach document accepts the challenges of the Manhood and no development is in Bracklesham or East Wittering. Birdham's own Neighbourhood Plan is currently being reviewed. The existing made Neighbourhood Plan says no development in the AONB which represents the views of the residents of the village. This site is not in the HELAA and any site which is in the AONB will be discounted. The character of Birdham is rural and there will be demonstrable harm to the AONB by this development, and the experience of the AONB to current residents would be dramatically reduced. The site proposed has not been used as agricultural land and that is his choice. The council must say what is right for the Parish. Birdham is fighting to have the number of houses allocated to it reduced. Cllr Bush said that he would move for this application to be rejected.

A member of the public said that there would be damage to the small historic core of Birdham. He said that it was a small area but a very important one.

It was asked why the traffic figures had been collected during lockdown. Mr White said that they had received instruction to do this in May/June and that the traffic survey had been conducted by the applicant's traffic consultants.

Cllr Churchill said that his concern was the increase of traffic that such a development would bring – 25 homes was equal to 25 – 50 cars all using Church Lane/Crooked Lane which experienced a huge volume of traffic especially in the summer months. He would anticipate a large increase in traffic and this would have wider implications for pedestrian safety (especially children on the way to school in Crooked Lane) and the A286.

Another member of the public said that the fatalities on the A286 were not to be ignored it was a very dangerous road. He said that a traffic survey that had been undertaken earlier in the year in Church Lane had been removed as it was unauthorised – he did not know whether this was to do with the proposed development. He said that since 2002 the amount of traffic on the A286 had been classed as unsustainable.

Cllr Glover said that the Council as a body had always worked together and uniformly to protect the AONB and to oppose any development in it regardless.

Cllr Campbell said that the Neighbourhood Plan had only been made 4 years ago and had gone to referendum in the village. The vision of Birdham was to maintain the AONB and its rural setting and character.

Cllr Firmston said that there were already 74 comments on the CDC planning portal and another 14 to come. Of these 40 opposed the development and 11 could agree. The Harbour Conservancy have asked for an extension to be able to comment after their meeting on 25th January.

The plans showed stock housing which were almost identical which was not at all conducive to housing on Church Lane – a rural lane – and this was an example of development urbanising a rural area. He said that with imagination this field could be put to better use.

Mr Langmead said that a cycle/footpath could only be of benefit, and that compared to the 300 homes being proposed on the other side of the A286 this was a very

small development. He said that they had given some real thought to this development trying to maintain the rural open space. The development would be of benefit to the community as they had spoken to the Cricket club about another pitch or even a community pub which could only be accessed on foot. The land has no running water and cannot be used for grazing and it is not an agricultural land holding of any significance. He said that at his previous meeting with some councillors they had made it clear that no comment could be made unless a planning application had been submitted, which is what he had done. He said that the application had taken much time to put together and to submit. He thanked the Council for discussing the application and said that anyone could contact him to discuss further.

Cllr Pocock proposed, and Cllr Churchill seconded, that the Council strongly object to the application on the following grounds:

- the demonstrable harm to the AONB by the nature, location and design of the development
- the implications of the increased traffic on Church Lane/Crooked Lane and on the already unsustainable A286 leading to increased pedestrian risk so close to the primary school
- lack of infrastructure : sewage (Sidlesham treatment works already at 97% capacity); school places
- Birdham Neighbourhood Plan has a policy of no development within the AONB and this site is not in the newly published HELAA of CDC

5 councillors voted for; none against; 1 abstention. The clerk will post the council's objection on the planning portal.

The Chairman thanked all those for taking part in the discussion.

(Mr White and Mr Langmead left the meeting at 8.10pm).

The meeting went on to discuss the other applications:

Planning application number	Address	Details	Comment
BI/20/02772/DOM	74 Crooked Lane	Demolition of metal shed and erection of workshop	NO OBJECTION but to submit comment on suitability of brightness of roof
BI/20/02857/DOM	Glen Iris Bell Lane	Proposed Oak Framed Garage with home office above.	NO OBJECTION on the proviso that the garage/home office is not used for permanent residential purpose or sold separately.
BI/20/02966/DOM	Tides Reach, 30 Greenacres	proposed single storey side infill gym extension	NO OBJECTION
BI/20/02942/DOM	Ambler , 12A Burlow Close, Birdham, PO20 7ES	Demolition of 2 no. garages and erection of garage, rear and side extensions and conversion of loft to habitable accommodation with 2no. front dormers.	NO OBJECTION
BI/20/02620/TPA	Rear Of 27 Rowan Close, Birdham, PO20 7FF	Removal of the lowest 2 no. lower limbs/laterals on the southern sector 1 no. Monterey Pine tree within Group, G2 subject to BI/83/00023/TPO	TO LEAVE TO THE DISCRETION OF CDC HENRY WHITBY
BI/20/02770	Birdham Marina	installation of 10 Wi-Fi masts Marina	NO OBJECTION
BI/20/02775/DOM	Cowdray Barn Birdham Road	Replacement external pool and single storey pool house	NO OBJECTION on the proviso that the pool house is not used for permanent residential purpose or sold separately.

BI/20/03141/TCA -	West Bell House Bell Lane	Notification of intention to pollard to approx. 5m on 1 no. Willow tree (T1).	TO LEAVE TO THE DISCRETION OF CDC HENRY WHITBY
BI/20/02965/DOM	Merrieweather 18 Greenacres Birdham PO20 7HL	Variation of condition 2 from planning permission BI/20/01237/DOM - Amendments to balcony on the north elevation (3 no. two storey extensions and 1 no. single storey extension to the east elevation, erection of 1 no. shed and associated works).	NO OBJECTION to balcony but not enough information on proposed shed and associated works to make a comment
BI/20/03034/OUT Sam Langmead Application	Land and Buildings on The South Side of Church Lane Birdham West Sussex	Erection of 25 no. dwellings comprising 17 open market and 8 affordable units with access, landscaping open space and associated works	OBJECTION

v. Delegated decisions to be noted

Planning application number	Address	Details	Decision
BI/20/02589/DOM -	Creekside , 28 Greenacres, Birdham, PO20 7HL	Demolition of garage, single storey extension, renovations of existing dwelling. Detached garage	PERMIT
20/02398	Loxworth Main Road	Single storey front and side extn	WITHDRAWN

4. Public Question time from residents of Birdham in accordance with Standing Orders 1d – 11 There were none.

5. To receive a report from WSCC member for Birdham Cllr Montyn

Cllr Montyn reported that applications for the marina and canal (one had just come in today) are very much live on the agenda of the Harbour Conservancy and CDC and they are looking at the legal side of the events that have taken place to date and those that could take place. They are looking at what is allowable generally.

He will comment on the flooding issue under item 8.

6. To receive reports from CDC members for Birdham

Cllr Taylor reported that last week the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government said that they were going to drop across-the-board use of the housing numbers algorithm proposed in the Planning for the Future document. It will not be used universally across England and some areas will continue to use their current methodology. CDC has been told to continue using its 2017 methodology which was confirmed in 2019.

The revised allocations mean that the council can look at the evidence base and CDC must test that evidence base.

Cllr Campbell said that the revised allocation for Birdham was 200 homes. The government talked about protecting the AONB and then CDC squeezed in 200 homes. Cllr Bush added that CDC should realize that Birdham spent an inordinate amount of time looking at the evidence base, and that the HELAA did not conform. He said that even if those numbers went forward Birdham would point out the deficiencies in due process undertaken by CDC to the Inspector.

It was also asked of Cllr Taylor to ask CDC to establish whether Southern Water discharged into Pagham Lagoon; how much and how often. Southern Water was obliged to report when it discharged into Chichester Harbour but not into the Lagoon.

Cllr Taylor to report back.

(Cllr Taylor left the meeting at 8.45pm).

7. Planning matters – covered above

8. Birdham Neighbourhood Plan Review 2020 – 2035:

i. Update

Cllr Campbell reported that the NP review group had appointed the company Genesis to evaluate all the sites proposed under the “Call for Sites”. They have also applied to the government body AECOM for technical assistance. This application has already been approved and a second application will be made for technical advice on “Design Codes” for the plan.

The Cycling and Pedestrian sub-committee of Cllr Pocock and Mr Thomson had been very successful in their endeavours.

Mr Thomson had had meetings concerning air quality around the very dangerous and congested A286. He had also been working with the Chichester Canal Society’s civil engineer, and Mr Sumnal a retired chief executive of Arun District Council. They have been looking at what would need to be done for a cycle route from Birdham to Chichester to become reality. There is one remaining part which is between Chichester marina and Donnington. The estimate for completion of this section of the route is about £200K. This would then mean that a cycle route ran from Chichester to W. Wittering.

Cllr Montyn said that WSCC have much to do with this issue and in the New Year on 19th January he would be having a meeting with the Head of the PROW network and he would bring this to his attention with regard to the legalities and monies.

ii. Response to CDC letter on CDC Local Plan re housing numbers for Birdham

Cllr Campbell said that the team had drafted a response to Toby Ayling CDC re housing numbers. He will circulate to Councillors, but it should be delivered before Christmas.

Action

Cllr Campbell/Clerk

(Cllr Bush left the meeting at 9pm).

9. Drainage Projects

i. Potential project for Crooked Lane/Church Lane and Elscott Park, Sidlesham Lane following ineligibility for Watershed funds

Cllr Firmston reported that over a year ago heavy flooding had taken place in Crooked Land and Church Lane. In a year nothing had been done to alleviate the situation and now the water was getting as far as Westlands. Until now the council had been led to believe that a joint Watershed project with WSCC could resolve the problem. However, it had transpired that the project was too big for Watershed and would have to be undertaken by WSCC as a Capital project. On 30th November Cllr Firmston asked for a virtual meeting with Kevin McVeigh of WSCC but he had had no acknowledgement and no meeting.

The road was now closed and was causing real problems for the Primary School. How to get WSCC to deal with this issue before another year went by was the challenge.

Cllr Montyn said that the fact that they had not discovered earlier that it was more work than can be met under Watershed was annoying. He said that the full extent of what this would involve as a capital project was unknown. Clearly this needed to be upscaled and the effect on the school and the church were important in this effort.

He said that it did seem to be a problem caused by roots of trees/bushes and that the work to be undertaken next week by WSCC with a root cutter may clear the problem. In the longer term the council needed to press hard for this to be taken up as a capital project. He asked to be kept informed of all actions.

Cllr Firmston asked the clerk to write a letter to Matt Davies Director of Highways, Transport and Planning, with copies to Leigh Harris Executive Director; Roger Elkins WSCC Cabinet member for Highways and Infrastructure.

Action	Clerk
--------	-------

A member of the public said that he had walked out today along Church Lane and that the sign had been knocked over and sign debris was floating in the water. Lorries and vans were driving through the water, and some driving the wrong way down the one-way road.

Cllr Firmston said that the problems at Ellscott Park in Sidlesham still had not moved forward either. CDC had said that this was predominantly a riparian issue and to do with ditch clearance.

(Cllr Montyn left the meeting at 9.15pm)

ii. Update on Watershed works for last week in Crooked Lane

Not yet completed but no doubt being hampered by flooding issue.

10. Clerk's report

i) Correspondence

- a) Katherine Eels routine rights of way inspection completed. Nothing untoward except some finger posts need attention and some areas of surface vegetation.
- b) Census March 21st 2021. This will be principally online, and the Parish needs to make sure that everyone is aware as NHS and Government rely on the statistics that it produces. How to reach out to more vulnerable of community who might not have access to IT is to be thought about.
- c) Fields In Trust (formerly National Playing Fields association). BPC used to pay £35 membership fee, but this has now gone up to £65 so last year's payment was considered a donation. This is just to benefit from information on Protection and support of parks and green spaces. The recreation ground is not "protected" (protection is a legally binding agreement that space will be held in perpetuity and cannot be revoked). The Council agreed to pay the full membership fee of £65

Action	Clerk
--------	-------

- d) The All-Parishes meeting will be held virtually on Monday 8th February at 5.30pm. Agenda to be distributed nearer the time.
- e) From CDC: “Prevent” duty to make sure that no PC spaces are rented out to extreme groups. Prevention of extremism remains a key consideration for national security. Clerk has forwarded to Village Hall. Although West Sussex has been less affected by terrorism activity in this regard there has been extreme activity from Far-Right groups expressed locally
- f) The Mobile Waste Facility agreement has been signed by all those partaking and billing will be towards the end of next financial year
- g) WSALC – Bolney Parish Council has written to NALC to protest their concerns about being left without a county association. WSALC are not answering emails sent to them. The Council agreed that a letter from Birdham should also be sent to NALC firstly expressing their support for Trevor Leggo and value from SSALC, and also expressing their mystification with the actions of WSALC.
- h) Budget revision 5 – the tax base for Birdham has been reduced. The clerk altered the budget accordingly. Cllr Glover proposed and Cllr Churchill seconded the amendment. Unanimously **RESOLVED.**

ii) Nominations for Green Links Across the Manhood (GLAM) representative; Recreation Ground Representative

Following the resignation of Mr Richardson, the two above representatives needed to be replaced. It was suggested that Mr Thomson might like to be the representative for GLAM on behalf of the council. The clerk to enquire. Cllr Churchill was happy to continue as the Recreation ground representative on his own.

iii) Parish Council Leases/Property documents – motion to send to Records’ Office – to be deferred to next meeting

iv) To approve the Payments for consideration a further bill had come from the external auditor for £480. Cllr Pocock proposed, and Cllr Churchill seconded the payments for consideration. Unanimously **RESOLVED.**

v) Expenditure to date and Bank reconciliation – circulated.

11. Councillor Reports:

- i. Play area and playing field – no report**
- ii. Village green and pond - no report**
- iii. Communication working group – no report**
- iv. Community resilience – no report**
- v. Manhood Peninsula Action Group – no report**

12. Reports of meetings attended by Councillors

Manhood Peninsula Partnership 7th December 2020 - Cllr Firmston report:

- 1. The sea defences at Medmerry are in a critical state. If they break a freshwater pool is at risk. The Environment Agency reported wood from various groynes will be removed to change the wave direction.

2. Wildlife Corridors. Some existing corridors run north / south leading from wetlands to the Downs. Need some corridors to run east / west from wetland to wetland. The more linkages for wildlife the better. Also, buffer zones around the Harbour and Medmerry areas are possible.
The MMP to write to CDC Planning Policy Team, Toby Ayling, to highlight the need for east / west wildlife corridors.
3. Greenways on the Peninsula. The nine-mile cycleway from Selsey to Chichester is progressing. Some sections need to be negotiated with landowners. The type of surface treatments required are in discussion and the Canal Trust are involved. The Greenway proposal required an Ecological Impact Assessment, and this has been completed by the Sustrans organisation covering 280 pages.
4. Trees and Funding. New national scheme is emerging, and CDC is one of five district councils invited to take part. Funding is available from DEFRA . Three different schemes are to be piloted; Year 1 encourage landowners to plant trees, Year 2 free trees, Year 3 trees at subsidised cost.

Also need to encourage trees in hedgerows and agro-forestry. The priority is to plant trees beyond existing woodlands.

5. CDC Local Plan. The Plan is now taking into account sea level rises and not building in low lying areas. There is currently a planning application in West Wittering that is on the red flooding zone. Must consider the year 2150 inundation scenario.
6. Manhood Wildlife Heritage Group / FLOW Update. The formal project ends in March 2021 and the nine parishes involved will each receive a Management Plan by June 2021. Each plan will list the work to be undertaken by each parish's local volunteers. The MWHG / FLOW is considering becoming a Nature Recovery Network Delivery partner to help create greater nature linkage across the Peninsula.

13. Items for inclusion on the next agenda

- **Parish Council Properties and Leases**
- **Footpaths that need to be saved**
- **Recreation ground drainage**
- **CIL funds and what to spend them on**

14. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be on Monday 18th January 2021 at 7pm

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 9.40pm

Signed:

Tim Firmston - Chairman

Date:

Birdham Parish Payments for Consideration
Meeting 21st December 2020

Balances on accounts:

Current account	£ 4,496.34
Deposit account	£ 40,788.63
NS account	£ 7,041.84
Total	£ 02,326.81

Received since last meeting

interest	£ 3.51
	£ 3.51

Paid since last meeting

B Geary	litter picking	£ 70.00
I whitaker	clerk salary	£ 765.58
I whitaker	pension	£ 52.48
A Dover	Sep bus stop and grass cut	£ 220.00
A Dover	Oct bus stop and grass cut	£ 100.00
Local Council Update	sub (50%)	£ 50.00
SLCC	sub (50%)	£ 90.00
m H Kennedy and son	grass cutting	£ 250.38
sse	electricity	£ 143.82
noticeboard company	noticeboard	£ 325.20
salc	training (remains as credit)	£ 36.00
process matters 2	neighbourhood plan	£ 250.00
	Total	£ 2,353.46

Payments for consideration

Andrew Brett	handy man	£ 70.00
B Geary	litter picking	£ 70.00
I Whitaker	salary	£ 509.90
I Whitaker	pension	£ 52.48
HMRC	Contributions	£ 130.11
Playdale	Tractor	£ 3,277.80
A Dover	Grass cutting	£ 50.00
	Waterside Western	
Landbuild	Drain	£ 17,487.36
sse	electricity	£ 98.33

Birdham Parish Council Meeting of 21st December 2020

Bank accounts as of 12th November 2020

Current Account	54496.34
Deposit Account	140788.63
National Savings unpaid cheques	7041.84
Total	202326.81

Opening balance 1st April 2020	136412.94
add receipts in the year	99945.65
less expenditure to date	34,031.78
Balance	202326.81

Less

Reserve @ 50% of Precept	25304.00
Total	25304.00

Ringfenced Funds

Op Watershed	16952.76
Culvert Ditch Maintenance	3500.00
Village Triangle Kingfisher ponds	512.00
Adams bequest (Fencing)	6500.00
CIL Payments	83990.66
NHB	4843.24
Neighbourhood Plan Grant	8908.23
Total	125206.89

Available Funds

Total	51815.92
--------------	-----------------

Signed: *IXWhitaker - Clerk**18/12/2020*

Birdham Parish Council		Precept Calculation 2021 - 22						
		Budget					Proposed	
Revenue Account		2020- 2021	YTD	Available	Projection	Carried Fwd	Budget	
							2020-2021	
Administrative Expenses								
1	Clerk's Salary	9023.04	7407.33	1615.71	9023.04	0.00	9113.27	
	+ Home/Office Allowance	450.00	337.50	112.50	450.00	0.00	450.00	
	National Insurance - Employer	130.00					131.30	
	Workplace Pension - Employer 3%	270.69		270.69			273.39	
	Workplace Pension - Employee 5%			0.00				
2	Council running costs (telephone/broadband/stationery)	450.00	409.16	40.84	547.00	-97.00	500.00	
3	Audit Fees	700.00	228.00	472.00	609.00	91.00	750.00	
4	Data protection officer/ICO	0.00	302.80	-302.80	-302.80	-302.80	220.00	
5	Insurance	1375.00	1255.69	119.31	1255.69	119.31	1260.00	
6	Loan Repayment	17182.08	8591.04	8591.04	17182.08	0.00	17182.08	
7	Hire of Hall for Council Meetings	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
8	Chairman's Discretionary Fund	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	25.00	25.00	
9	Training for Councillors	300.00	120.00	180.00	120.00	180.00	200.00	
10	Councillors' Travel Expenses	50.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	50.00	10.00	
11	Subscriptions & Memberships NALC/SALC	700.00	717.36	-17.36	717.36	-17.36	720.00	
12	Charitable Contributions & Donations	500.00	369.25	130.75	369.25	130.75	250.00	
13	Manhood Pen Partnership	450.00	438.00	12.00	438.00	12.00	450.00	
14	Election Contingency	325.00	0.00	325.00	0.00	325.00	0.00	
15	Publications	250.00	0.00	250.00	70.00	180.00	50.00	
16	Parish Newsletter	350.00	0.00	350.00	50.00	300.00	350.00	
17	Community Resilience	100.00		100.00	25.00	75.00	50.00	
		32630.81	20176.13	12324.68	30553.62	1,070.90	31985.04	
Land Maintenance								
18	Grass Cutting	2318.00	1771.90	546.10	2318.00	0.00	2390.00	
19	Hedges and Ditching	2000.00		2000.00	2000.00	0.00	2060.00	
20	Playing Field & Play Area Repairs & Maintenance	1500.00	0.00	1500.00	1500.00	0.00	500.00	
21	Maintenance of Football Pitch	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
22	Churchyard Maint - Grant	325.00	325.00	0.00	325.00	0.00	325.00	
23	Village, Triangle & Kingfisher Ponds Maint	1500.00	988.00	512.00	1088.00	412.00	750.00	
24	Culvert & Ditch Maintenance	3500.00	0.00	3500.00	3500.00	0.00	3500.00	
25	Collection of Litter	840.00	560.00	280.00	840.00	0.00	840.00	
		11983.00	3644.90	8338.10	11571.00	412.00	10365.00	
Street Lighting								
26	Energy	1545.00	2009.01	-464.01	2453.00	-998.00	1200.00	
27	Repairs & Maintenance	1217.00	0.00	1217.00	1217.00	0.00	1217.00	
		2762.00	2009.01	752.99	3670.00	-998.00	2417.00	
General								
28	Bus Shelters - Repairs/renew	1000.00		1000.00	0.00	1,000.00	500.00	
29	Bus Shelters - Clearance	250.00	142.00	108.00	250.00	0.00	250.00	
30	Notice Boards - Repairs	500.00	271.00	229.00	271.00	229.00	250.00	
31	Bins - dogs & litter	1500.00	551.72	948.28	1500.00	0.00	1500.00	
33	Mobile waste facility	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	4500.00	
		3250.00	964.72	2285.28	2021.00	1229	7000.00	
Capital Expenditure								
34	Website Main/hosting/.gov email	500.00	230.00	270.00	410.00	90.00	550.00	
35	Fencing of Adams Bequest	7000.00	500.00	6500.00	500.00	6,500.00	6500.00	
36	Neighbourhood Plan contingency	500.00	528.49	-28.49	500.00	0.00	500.00	
37	IT MS 365 and support/laptop/zoom	0.00	1482.47	-1482.47	-1936.04	-1,936.04	1350.00	
38	Ponds improvement long term	0.00		512.00	512.00	0.00	500.00	
		8000.00	2740.96	5771.04	-14.04	4653.96	0	
		58625.81	29535.72	29472.09	47801.58	6367.86		
Plan for 2021 - 22								
Estimated Gross Expenditure		61167.04					61167.04	
Less Estimated Income		0.00						
Brought Fwd		6367.86						
From Reserves		0.00						
Net Expenditure		54799.18					54799.18	
Precept 2017/2018 (base)								
		801.80	45911	<i>Band D</i>	57.26	4.35%		
Precept 2018/2019(base)								
		801.80	47906	<i>Band D</i>	59.75	4.40%		
Precept 2019/2020								
		824.50	48792	<i>Band D</i>	59.18	0.90%	1	
Precept 2020/2021								
		839.50	50608	<i>Band D</i>	60.28	1.85%		
Precept 2021/2022								
		837.40	54799	<i>Band D</i>	65.44	8.56%	£5.16 increase p/annum	