

DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting Held at Dogmersfield Primary School 14th December 2015


Councillors present:

Cllr Geoff Beaven (GB)
 Cllr Alastair Clark (AJC)
 Cllr Graham Leach (GL)
 Cllr Joanna Thomas (JT)
 Cllr Mike Ricketts (MR)
 CLERK Claire Inglis (CI)

Members of Public present:


Mary Morrison Steph Thomas Kirsty Cary (KC)
 B J Leversha Julie Banks (JB) Brian White
 Chris Waller Elizabeth Waller (EW) Christine Smith
 Jeremy Robson (JR) Cllr Ken Crookes (KC)

131/15	Agenda item 1	<p><u>Welcome & Apologies</u></p> <p>All Dogmersfield Parish Councillors in attendance.</p> <p>In addition apologies were received from Cllr S Gorys, Cllr J Kennett and Cllr J Glen.</p> <p>GB opened the meeting and extended a welcome particularly to anyone attending a DPC meeting for the first time. GB highlighted the two important matters that were due for discussion during the meeting and would take public participation at that time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress on our Neighbourhood plan. • Hart DC's consultation on Refined Options for meeting the areas housing needs until 2032. 	
132/15	Agenda item 2	<p><u>Declaration of interests – current agenda</u></p> <p>None were received</p>	
133/15	Agenda item 3	<p><u>Public Participation</u></p> <p>No items were raised under Public Participation.</p>	
134/15	Agenda item 4	<p><u>To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9th November 2015</u></p> <p>It was resolved that the minutes (117/15 to 130/15) be accepted as a true record and they were signed by GB (JT proposed, AJC seconded, MR abstained as he was not at the meeting and all others were in favour).</p>	
135/15	Agenda item 5	<p><u>Matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 9th November 2015</u></p> <p>The outstanding action list was considered at this time with many items due for consideration as an agenda item below.</p> <p>Other actions outstanding or completed are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GB confirmed culvert work was carried out by the Dogmersfield Dad's the results of the work can only be assessed after heavy rainfall. There may be a collapse in the culvert. This will be monitored. • AJC continues to retain highway issues on the Highways Partnership meeting agendas. 	AJC




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

135/15	Agenda item 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Dog Mess' signs some have been installed to be completed. • Date to be diarised for walk of footpaths and inspection of Parish assets to be moved to Spring 2016. • AJC and CI to monitor emails alerting commencement of works to Basingstoke Canal and notify residents when known. • Lengthsman monies received in month. • Centralised record of volunteer days has been circulated. • Risk assessment and electrical inspection of Christmas lights has taken place. • Church Lane planning submission deadline was met. • Solstice anti-bribery compliance form and Community Contribution Benefit agreement were returned to Solstice. • Odiham pre-submission NHP response was submitted. • Budget was reworked following discussions. • CPT has been stood down until spring 2016. • Solstice to be contacted to obtain construction start date for liaison on traffic management. • Amanda Ingham of HIWWT to be contacted to arrange visit to PGN to obtain advice on way forward. • Fleet speed watch team have agreed to include Dogmersfield in areas to target. 	<p>AJC CI AJC/CI</p> <p>CI CI</p>
136/15	Agenda item 6	<p><u>Finance and Regulatory Matters</u></p> <p><u>To receive and approve financial statement of account from 1st – 30th November, confirm payments made in November and authorise any payments now due</u></p> <p>CI reported the bank balance at end of November stands at £8,589.54 and this has been agreed by AJC and signed. During November the following payments made are confirmed below:</p> <p>Chq no: 948 £75 Hants & IOW CRC Ltd CPT visit Sept 15 Chq no: 949 £70 Geoff Beaven Expenses Chq no: 950 £397 Clerk Nov 15 salary Chq no: 951 £34.63 Auriol Wines NHP event</p> <p>CI also confirmed receipt of £1,100 for the Lengthsman funding 2015/16. Current committed expenditure relates to CPT visits not yet invoiced totalling £225.</p> <p>It was resolved that the statement of accounts be accepted as a true record and payments listed therein be confirmed (GL proposed, GB seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p>CI requested authorisation of the following payments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 2015 Clerk Salary payment £397.00 due 20th of the month • Community Payback Team £75 for December 4th visit • Peter Barton for electrical safety certificate £30 <p>It was resolved to authorise the 3 payments to be settled as listed upon receipt of relevant paperwork (invoice or expense claim) (AJC proposed, JT seconded and all were in favour).</p>	




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

<p>136/15</p>	<p>Agenda item 6</p>	<p><u>To report on response from insurers re updated Asset register</u></p> <p>The revised asset register updated following the November meeting was issued to the insurance company. They have acknowledged the revised asset values and will update the schedule if DPC are in agreement with the following treatment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insure items 1 to 6 under the Street Furniture category for a total sum insured of £6,500 • Items 8 and 9 are automatically insured by the standard limit of £5,000 provided for office equipment within the core covers section of the policy so do not need to be noted on the schedule • Insure item 12 under the Gates & Fences category for a sum insured of £2,800 • Due to items 11,13 and 14 being located in different places and their individual values all being less than the £250 policy excess there is no merit in covering these against loss or damage. <p>It has been confirmed that no change to the premium will result from these changes.</p> <p>It was agreed that the items on the asset register be updated as advised by Came & Co on the insurance schedule and CI would issue an updated copy.</p> <p><u>To approve the Budget for 2016/17</u></p> <p>A draft straw person version of the budget for 2016/17 was discussed at the November meeting. At that time endorsement was given to the principles of increasing the level of budget to cover a number of items, and consideration to increasing the level of precept to cover this whilst bolstering the dwindling reserves and recognising potential financial risks such as the likelihood of the lengthsman scheme discontinuing. AJC confirmed that strong indication has been given to lengthsman funding happening in 2016/17.</p> <p>Based on these principles CI has drawn up a draft budget for 2016/17 which in rounded terms increases the total provisions for expenditure headings by just less than £2,000 when compared to the budget for 2015/16 approved this time last year.</p> <p>The provisions for internal operations have been kept more or less the same as last year but with one significant increase to cover the full cost of an election in May 2016. This may be needed as 2016 is an all-out year for Dogmersfield where all councillors have to resign and an election may result. The provisions for maintenance are increased primarily to cover the potential cost of tree work on Pilcot Green. A provision is also made for the neighbourhood plan although most of this cost will be met from government grants.</p> <p>The draft budget will require an increase to the precept of about £2,000 and in the unlikely event that every penny of the budget is spent the outturn bank balance at the end of the financial year will be only £2,000. However DPC are confident that this is unlikely and if necessary will be able make some savings in year. Consequently the anticipated outturn balance will be similar to that predicted for the current financial year which is in the order of £5,500.</p> <p>Incidentally there need be no restrictions on when work to the traffic island remodelling takes place as although this work is not included in the predicted outturn for 2015/16 a provision is made in the draft budget for 2016/17 which can be saved if the work is paid for during this financial year.</p> <p>GB asked for any comments. None were received.</p> <p>It was resolved that the proposed budget for 2016/17 be approved as per the summarised details below:</p>	<p>CI</p>
---------------	----------------------	---	-----------




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

136/15	Agenda item 6	<p>Income budget be set targeting a £2,000 total increase in the amount of the Precept TBC in January 2016 plus assumed continuation of Lengthsman scheme funding in 2016/17 of £1,000.</p> <p>Expenditure budget set as £14,245 and split as follows: £8,900 Internal Operations £4,845 Service Delivery £500 Contingency (GB proposed, MR seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p>GB also confirmed that the salary review for the Clerk has taken place and the proposal agreed by all councillors. CI has also confirmed her agreement of the review and this will be reflected in the budget.</p> <p><u>To discuss draft recommendations of Hampshire Electoral review and agree if DPC should respond before closing date of 11th January ex-committee if required</u></p> <p>CI had circulated the recommendations from the electoral review prior to the meeting. DPC had submitted a response at the time of the original consultation requesting that it remain part of a rural ward. The DPC ward has changed and will now be included in the Hartley Wintney and Yateley West electoral boundary. It was agreed that no response be submitted as all were content that this creates no issues other than a change of County Councillor. David Simpson is currently the County Councillor for this ward.</p>	CI
137/15	Agenda item 7	<p><u>Planning</u></p> <p><u>Report on current planning applications and confirmation of Parish Council responses</u></p> <p>The following applications were discussed and decisions noted where applicable:</p> <p>15/02111/AMCON Equestrian Centre removal and variation of approval conditions: As indicated earlier the Parish Council objected to the proposed changes. Subsequently DPC was invited to comment on a further communication from the owners of the centre which tried to point out why DPC concerns were groundless. In response DPC suggested how Hart could respond positively to the owners stated needs through changes to all of the existing conditions without giving the owners complete freedom to do what they like on the site. Hart have given approval and worded their response along similar lines to the DPC submission. In general DPC is content with the outcome although inevitably it will mean some extra traffic through the village.</p> <p>15/021981 Blue Bell Lodge Lawful Development Certificate for siting of caravan: No change from last month.</p> <p>15/02077/HOU Fieldview side extension: This is a proposed extension that is in keeping with existing property and the Parish Council has submitted no objection. Hart DC have granted permission for the proposed extension together with 5 parking spaces to the front. At least ten vehicles were parked in recent days.</p> <p>15/00373/NMMA Four Seasons variation of conditions: These changes will allow the approved improvements to the building and other features to be carried out in phases. Hart DC has granted permission.</p> <p>15/02401/FUL Church Lane 3 dwellings: This application was discussed at the last meeting. An objection was drafted to reflect the points made and following ex-committee consideration it was submitted to Hart DC within the extended deadline.</p>	




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

<p>137/15</p>	<p>Agenda item 7</p>	<p>15/02669/CA Bushy House: This is the only new application this month. It seeks permission to fell 2 cypress trees and Hart DC has expressed no objections.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) to confirm the next steps and timescales</u></p> <p><u>Resources – manpower and grants</u></p> <p>The response to our drop-in event on 26th September was encouraging with about thirty people attending and 20 completed questionnaires. Nevertheless DPC did not feel that this level of support was enough to justify launching the process to produce a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Instead since the last meeting house to house calls have been carried out on nearly all of the households in the parish and with some repeated calls GB was pleased to report that the total number of completed questionnaires is now over 70 with maybe more in the pipeline.</p> <p>There are about 115 occupied dwellings in the parish and consequently residents from about 50% of these have now expressed their support for the plan and become engaged in the process. DPC has therefore concluded that we should now go ahead with the next steps. In completing the questionnaire a large number of residents indicated that they are willing to help out with various tasks but only two volunteered to become involved in a management role.</p> <p>The NHP must not be a DPC initiative and before setting up a Steering Committee conclusion is that GB should make contact with a number of people who we consider can be persuaded to help out at this level. Work on the HDC consultation is taking priority at the moment but I hope to be able to set up a steering committee in January. Conscious of the DCLG funding reductions announced in the Autumn statement the Council will now be requesting the available grants hopefully to be paid this financial year. Any engagement of consultants to support the process will depend on receipt of this funding. Given the amount of feedback from the questionnaire a vision statement can be started and objectives can be planned although it is already clear that some of these objectives are likely to at odds with the Refined Options consultation that we are due to discuss next.</p> <p><u>To discuss and confirm response to HDC Local Plan Consultation and how DPC will contact residents to promote completion of forms</u></p> <p>For some time now the Parish Council has been warning residents about the threat of a large development of new houses in and around Dogmersfield village. This threat has come much closer to reality with Hart DC's public consultation on its Refined Options for Delivering New Homes.</p> <p>In DPC's view the scope and content of the consultation is biased against the smaller communities and in particular either through deliberate design or incompetence it could disadvantage Dogmersfield. In these circumstances I believe that unprecedented actions are needed by the Council to inform residents and help them to try and avoid a devastating outcome for the village.</p> <p>In stark terms Hart DC needs to identify sites for 2,500 new homes to meet its local needs on top of all of the new developments approved and built since 2011. In addition under government rules Hart may well have to accommodate up to a further 3,000 new homes which may overspill from the neighbouring districts of Rushmoor and Surrey Heath.</p> <p>The consultation document identifies a wide range of sites being offered for new housing by landowners and groups these into three approaches by which these sites can be used to meet local and by implication also overspill needs. The three approaches are</p>	<p>GB</p>
---------------	----------------------	---	-----------




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

<p>137/15</p>	<p>Agenda item 7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to disperse the new houses to nominated towns and villages, • to extend existing major towns and • to build a new town at Winchfield. <p>The consultation asks respondents to rank these three approaches and to separately rank various combinations of these three approaches.</p> <p>None of the approaches is good for Dogmersfield as all three will have negative implications for our local environment impacting on our quality of life.</p> <p>Respondents are also invited to comment on some of the individual development sites and to rank these when there is more than one in a parish. Much detail is provided about the sites in each village but almost nothing about the strategic extensions and very little about the extent of a new settlement. Other questions are included and these are equally important.</p> <p>Many of you will know that there are six plots of land in Dogmersfield village that have offered up for new housing appearing on the SHLAA. For the purposes of the consultation for some inexplicable reason Hart DC have blocked together these six plots into a single site and concluded that this can provide 141 new houses. Everyone who responds to the consultation can now say whether they think that building 141 houses in Dogmersfield is a good or bad idea.</p> <p>This is the second time that Hart DC has carried a consultation on meeting housing needs along these lines and it is clearly apparent that the number of responses backing or opposing an option is very influential. Being a very small parish our views can easily be swamped by the responses from bigger villages and towns. However unfortunately the response rate is always very low with this type of survey 600 out of 35,000 possible at the last HDC consultation. Consequently if enough Dogmersfield residents do make the effort to respond to the consultation DPC believe that the outcome could be influenced.</p> <p>The great danger for Dogmersfield is that if enough people from all over Hart support the 141 figure Hart DC could also think that it is a good idea we could be faced with an allocation of 141 houses when the draft Local Plan is drawn up next year. Creating a NHP would become a pointless exercise and the implications for Dogmersfield residents of a massive housing estate twice as big as the existing village built on this site cannot be understated but devastating is not an unreasonable description.</p> <p>Also in the real world the Fisk field plot next to the primary school has been the subject of a scheme for 3 houses which does not appear to be active at present and there is a full planning application underway for 3 houses on two plots in Church Lane. In their wisdom Hart have concluded that these three plots can contribute 36 new houses out of the total of 141.</p> <p>GB asked for questions from the floor before confirming the steps that DPC are proposing to assist its residents.</p> <p>JR asked how many houses are currently in the village. GB responded that there are only 58 within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>EW asked if there was a minimum size of property in a conservation area. GB considered that the materials and design would be of more consideration.</p> <p>GB stated that the online format of the form is not easy and considered that many residents would want to look at a hard copy prior to submitting online. AJC considered that a version could be posted to the website.</p>	<p>CI</p>
---------------	----------------------	---	-----------




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

<p>137/15</p>	<p>Agenda item 7</p>	<p>JR asked KC on his position as a district councillor as the consultation sounds depressingly amateurish.</p> <p>In KC's view no one of the three options will suffice but a combination of the options will be required. Currently HDC has enough SHLAA sites to fulfil its own requirements and he is not as frightened of the prospect of accepting overspill from neighbouring districts as others. Surrey Heath is a long time away from not meeting their demands and there will be vigorous push back on Rushmoor who have enough to meet 15 years' worth of demand. HDC do not have to plan to meet these suggested overspills. KC is not happy with the consultation but does not share GB's view on it being against villages.</p> <p>KC cannot understand the grouping of sites in Dogmersfield and therefore it is imperative for DPC to advise how to respond and must make use of the additional comments box where residents should state that "this treatment is wholly inappropriate for Dogmersfield".</p> <p>KC will be ensuring that every comment is read.</p> <p>KC also confirmed that comments will be weighted by their postcode but admitted that he had not had sight of the weighting formulae. Darryl Phillips is not in a position to release this information as it may bias responses.</p> <p>JR asked if this level of detail had been debated and what the process was as the consultation seems so flawed.</p> <p>KC confirmed that this was debated at Council and council was extraordinarily divided. GL raised the point that HDC do not appear to be pushing development of brownfield sites. Work life model has changed significantly with remote working and many office buildings are sitting empty giving Ancells as an example. KC agreed but landlords cannot be forced into selling the properties for development. He confirmed that some have been sold for conversion to residential a total of 450 identified units and these will be counted towards the 2,500 requirement.</p> <p>GB expressed concern and disappointment over the We Heart Hart (clarified not WAG) flyer which asks residents to support brownfield sites in Dogmersfield listed as Fermoy and Schoolfield (which should not be considered brownfield, SHLAA Site 55). KG confirmed that We Heart Hart are completely separate from WAG although they do share some common ideals and are working together in some areas.</p> <p>KG pointed out that Hook were completely unaware until it was pointed out that a new town at Winchfield would closely border them and this has given them pause for thought. Developers do not have an incentive to develop on brownfield because of potential contamination and it significantly reduces profit margins. KG distributed a map to show the impact of the developments proposed.</p> <p>GB considered that the justification for Winchfield new town is based on taking the overspill from neighbouring districts and cannot be justified if HDC only need to plan for 2,500.</p> <p>EW asked that if landowners on SHLAA did not want to sell would they be required to by compulsory purchase. KC stated no.</p> <p>MR voiced the opinion that no development is possible without seriously addressing the infrastructure as even prior to such level of development the infrastructure cannot cope.</p> <p>KC agreed and this is where unsustainable development comes into play and advises use of this terminology in responding to the consultation.</p> <p>JB asked if DPC were going to provide residents with advice on wording in responding to the consultation? GB confirmed that if residents wanted to copy verbatim he would not have a problem with this.</p> <p>GB moved on to agree what assistance DPC would provide.</p>	
---------------	----------------------	--	--




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

137/15	Agenda item 7	<p>Hart have launched their consultation with most documents only available online. However, they will shortly be posting a summary of the consultation document to all residents.</p> <p>Hart want residents to submit their views online by completing a form on their website and this is a perfectly acceptable way of responding. However, the Parish Council is aware that many residents will prefer to fill in a paper based response and enough copies have been obtained of the form to give one to each household.</p> <p>It is DPC's duty to spell out the implications of this consultation to all our residents and to help and encourage them to express their views by responding to the consultation.</p> <p>The following steps are proposed:</p> <p>Step one: There will be a delivery to all households of a special Dear Resident letter spelling out the implications of the consultation and explain why it is in resident's interest to respond. This letter will enclose the hard copy response form together with a guidance document explaining how the document must be completed to ensure it is valid. This guidance document should inform residents how the Parish Council intends to fill in each mandated box and answer each question so they can follow this lead should they wish to do so.</p> <p>Drafts have already been created of both the letter and guidance document and the finalised versions should be printed and delivered by the end of the week.</p> <p>Step two: The closing date for submitting views is the 15th January 2016 and as further support to residents the Parish Council should hold a drop in event early in the New Year to provide an opportunity for residents to ask questions about the consultation and be helped to fill in a form on the spot. The Council will collect the forms and deliver them to Hart DC. We need to agree a date, venue and timings. CI will see if January 9th is available for hall hire.</p> <p>Step three: Over the days following the drop in event house to house calls should be made to support those residents that could not attend the drop in. Forms can be collected and delivered by the Council to Hart. It is anticipated that some residents will volunteer to participate in this activity. EW and KC offered their assistance in deliveries where required.</p>	<p>GB/AJC</p> <p>CI</p> <p>ALL</p>
138/15	Agenda item 8	<p><u>Environment & Rights of Way</u></p> <p><u>To report on progress from recent visit by Community Payback Team and agree preferred days for future CPT visits in 2016 and confirm with CPT administrators</u></p> <p>GB reported that on December 4th 5 members of the CPT were in attendance. The area to PGN is now completely tidy ready for winter. The wood pile was burnt and ditches were dug a bit deeper.</p> <p>CI would arrange CPT to return from April 2016 retaining Friday as the operation day as this suits Councillors enabling them to supervise.</p> <p><u>To receive confirmation of quotes for chicane work as agreed by Highways department and approve works to go ahead once appropriate licence application approved and contractor appointed in accordance with licence</u></p> <p>CI confirmed that Highways department were content for DPC to carry out the remodelling to two traffic island chicanes in the village to be laid to cobble stone. At this time CI has carried out the following actions to information gather to facilitate the project to progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtained application form to obtain licence to enable works to be carried out 	<p>CI</p>



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

138/15	Agenda item 8	<p>in the public highway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquired re level of fee for this licence – answer awaited • Asked contractor Goslings to confirm quote received is still valid for works and to confirm they have correct level of insurances and accreditation to New Roads and Street Works 1991 Code of practice – answer awaited • Contacted HDC to ask if planning permission required. CI informed councillors that a fee of £57.50 fee may be applicable to determine whether planning permission is required. Awaiting confirmation from the initial enquiry made to the planning department. <p>Upon receipt of responses CI would confirm outcomes to DPC and a decision will be made at that time to progress the project ensuring the contractor complies with all that is required for safe management of the highway whilst work is carried out.</p>	CI
139/15	Agenda item 9	<p><u>Highways</u></p> <p><u>To report any updates on Highways matters</u></p> <p>AJC confirmed that the next Highways partnership meeting is due in January and he continues to push the department for resolution to those issues that affect the roads/ drainage in the village.</p> <p>John Foggo is due to retire from the department but KC confirmed that the position is being actively recruited for a replacement.</p> <p>MR was aware of a loose post on Church Lane. AJC would see if this is causing any risk.</p>	AJC
140/15	Agenda item 10	<p><u>Other matters to report</u></p> <p>Community Liaison – <u>Update on possible implementation of Speed watch in village</u></p> <p>AJC will produce maps to forward to GB who will then liaise with the Fleet team on establishing safe points for a team to monitor.</p> <p>Training – Nothing to report</p> <p>Website – <u>Transparency Regulations: To receive a recommendation from the Clerk re submission of claim for costs incurred and to be incurred from the Transparency fund</u></p> <p>AJC in conversation with HALC is aware of funding from DCLG and available to parish councils with <£25k turnover in relation to the additional cost being incurred by them in updating websites to be Transparency compliant. CI has compiled a list of costs incurred to date and these are summarised here: £67.85 Training costs incurred (HALC course plus travel) £60.00 Clerk time to date to assess need and compile documents for website (6 hours @ £10 per hour) £210 Clerk estimate of time required to complete website data update (3 days @ 7hours) £60 Clerk time Jan – Mar to maintain updates (@ 2 hours per months).</p> <p>CI intends to continue with this work before January and if the estimate is accurate a claim will be submitted prior to the 15/2/16 deadline totalling approx. £397.85.</p> <p>Newsletter – None currently due but CI to discuss with MR a suggested timeline for a Spring issue before Easter.</p>	AJC/ GB



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

141/15	Agenda item 11	<p><u>Crime and Disorder Act, section 17</u></p> <p>No matters to discuss.</p>				
142/15	Agenda item 12	<p><u>Dates of future meetings</u></p> <p><u>2015/16</u></p> <p>Meetings are scheduled as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>January 11th</td> </tr> <tr> <td>February 8th</td> </tr> <tr> <td>March 14th</td> </tr> </table>	January 11 th	February 8 th	March 14 th	
January 11 th						
February 8 th						
March 14 th						
143/15	Agenda item 13	<p><u>Information Sharing</u></p> <p>GB confirmed that Charlie Parker is moving on from The Four Seasons in Dogmersfield. DPC built up a good relationship with him over the past few years and it will be important to continue this relationship with his replacement.</p> <p>AJC confirmed that information in relation to the new Audit regime is in circulation and this will be an important discussion point in January. AJC is due to attend a NALC meeting in December and will do some fact finding.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 9.16pm.</p>				

Signed.....
Chairman

Date.....



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Budget Proposal for 2016/17 approved at meeting of Dogmersfield Parish Council 14th December 2015

	2014/2015 Actual	2015/2016 Budget	2016/17 Budget Draft	Compare 2015/16 Budget with likely outturn [2014/15 actuals shown for reference]	2015/16 Likely Outturn
Internal operations					
Parish Clerk	£4,644	£4,765	£4,908	As per salary review To be adjusted dependent on salary review	£4,764
Subscriptions	£482	£650	£700	Outturn greater due to increased sub costs in joining membership see detail below	£699
Meeting costs	£336	£400	£442	Assumes outturn to include a further 2 additional meetings from Nov - March	£340
Training	£446	£250	£250	Outturn assumes no further cost bearing training this fin year	£230
Admin consumables	£107	£465	£300	Outturn allows for £40 safety cert and additional £150 admin consumables	£250
IT Upgrade	Nil	£500	£500	New laptop in 2015/16 to consider 2016/17	0
Website	£105	£120	£150	Outturn is as last year. 2015/16 budget at prior year actual (difference due to vat claimed)	£120
Parish insurance	£279	£300	£300	Outturn is actual for year	£265
Audit of accounts	£155	£200	£150	Outturn is actual for year	£155
Election contingency	£0	£600	£1,200	Elections costs anticipated in 2016/17	Nil
Total Internal operations	£6,554	£8,250	£8,900		£6,823
Service delivery					
Village maintenance	£1,280	£2,250	£2,845	See below Lengthsman	£954
Lengthsman Costs	985	£1,000	£1,000	Funding not yet certain therefore consider outturn in conjunction with Village Maint	£1,000
Neighbourhood Plan	Nil	Nil	£500	Now budget £500 virement from Contingency	£500
Project work to benefit the community	£387	£500	£500	Fencing repair in actual likely to be Outturn	£230
Total Service delivery	£2,652	£3,750	£4,845		£2,684
Contingency	£0	£500	£500		0
Total Budget	£9,206	£12,500	£14,245		£9,507