

## **BROUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of the Meeting of the Parish Council, held at Broughton Village Hall on Wednesday, 19 June 2013, commencing at 7.00pm.

Present: Cllr. Mrs. MC Rust (in the Chair).  
Cllrs. R Baxter, Mrs. HJ Bull, Mrs. JC Chester, Mrs. PA Cope, P Gordon, DJ Perkins, R Shrive, and Clerk to the Parish Council, Mr GA Duthie.  
Borough Councillor J Hakewill.  
County Councillor C Groome.  
PCSOs P Miller and D Fenner of Northamptonshire Police.  
Four members of the public.

**13/6879** **APOLOGIES.** Apologies for absence were tendered by (and accepted for the reasons noted):

Cllr. Mrs. P Roke (away on business)

**13/6880** **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.** None were made.

**13/6881** **MINUTES.** The draft minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 22 May 2013 and the special meeting of the Parish Council held on 5 June 2013, copies of both having been circulated, were approved by members and authorised for signature by the Chair.

**13/6882** **RIGHT TO SPEAK.** Local resident, Mr B Scouse, used this facility to ask the Parish Council if they could advise whether any maximum operated in respect of the number of planning applications that could be made for residential development whilst the current housing land supply shortfall endured. It was explained that no maximum number did apply in that way, and until consents started to translate into new housing actually being delivered such that supply became assured, it was likely the presumptions of the NPPF would prompt applications in village edge locations; especially in those locations where any degree of sustainability could be claimed.

**13/6883** **POLICE REPORT.** Members received a briefing from attending officers on reports of crime for the month of May, and noted that three reports had been received; these being one each of burglary to an outbuilding, criminal damage, and domestic violence. Councillors then heard that, in Northamptonshire, PCSOs had now been empowered to perform all the enforcement functions of traffic wardens. This was in addition to existing functions and did not represent a change in the emphasis of the PCSO role but would, certainly, result in an increase in the number of fixed penalty notices being issued. In response to a query, it was confirmed that obstruction and other similar issues did fall within the new powers.

Cllr. Baxter then advised that vehicle speed remained a concern in the village, with a particular issue existing at Kettering Road. The attending officers noted this and stated they would ask for this location to be focused on.

Cllr. Gordon mentioned that there appeared to be an issue currently with obscene graffiti being daubed in some locations, the latest being at the knick Knack footway. Members heard that a removal service was offered by the local authorities.

Cllr. Perkins reported that the High Street recreation ground had suffered acts of vandalism recently in that one of the young trees recently established there had been broken down and destroyed. The attending officers confirmed an eye would be kept on the area during summer months.

**13/6884**

**MATTERS ARISING.** As an initial item here, County Cllr. Groome suggested and it was agreed that future meeting agendas have a standing item for reports of County and Borough Councillors. The meeting heard that a report had been circulated by County Cllr. Groome that provided details of a reorganisation of County Council scrutiny arrangements involving Cllr. Groome's appointment to the new Corporate Parenting Board. Other issues of recent concern included school transport provision following the revisions to the school leaving age, the Borough Council consultation on proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites (especially relating to Highcroft Farm), the provision of assistance to Cllr. Hakewill in his new capacity as Chair of Finance Scrutiny, and continuation of lobbying activity in connection with railway and highway investment, and performance as LANRAC chairman.

In connection with the Gypsy and Traveller site consultation, members had been circulated with an account of various issues relating to and arising from the proposal for Highcroft Farm, where it was apparent that communications with the occupiers of the site had been ineffective and where significant distress had seemingly and regrettably been suffered due to the manner in which the tenants there had learned of the inclusion of the site in the consultation. The meeting noted that the consultation itself, regardless of any policy decision that might result, did not serve to over-reach whatever contractual rights of occupation existed and a dialogue between those concerned had now commenced in order to assess the County Council's intentions as landowner.

Arising from 13/6811, which reflected annual estimates for 2013/14 being approved allowing for £2,500 toward grants to local organisations and other discretionary expenditure, it was reported that the Broughton Playing Fields and Village Hall Association had now conformed, as anticipated when the estimate was set, that further improvement and refurbishment projects at the village hall were in hand. These include toilet facilities, to the main corridor area incorporating redecoration and flooring, and to the heating, décor and furniture within the Meachem room. Members noted this latter aspect alone was forecast to cost some £2,000 or so and that the other two elements were being supported by other bodies including Kettering Borough Council. Accordingly, it was **RESOLVED** that £2,000 be advanced by grant to the Association in connection with these initiatives given the value of the hall as a village facility.

Arising from 13/6876, and following the decision to seek designation of the entire parish as the neighbourhood area for the purpose of the plan, a plan showing the actual boundary concerned was produced and this was agreed to be used for purposes of the request. In connection with the supporting statement also required by the regulations to be notified at the time the request is made, it was agreed that a draft statement would be considered as an early issue for the new committee and Cllr. Mrs. Bull would advise once this was settled.

In connection with the establishment of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee, it was

suggested by the Chair and agreed that a committee of 10 was needed and this should include 4 parish councillors. Those four parish councillors were decided to be:

- Cllr. Mrs. HJ Bull
- Cllr. R Shrive
- Cllr. R Baxter
- Cllr. DJ Perkins

The meeting noted that 25 members of the public had expressed an interest in participating in the exercise, so there should be little difficulty in filling the balance of the committee places, with scope to call for additional assistance if/when necessary.

It was agreed that the committee should follow CPRE and NALC guidance in connection with its structure, terms of remit and proceedings. It was thought likely that monthly meetings would be necessary, at least initially.

Key information and links to on-line documents concerning the Neighbourhood Plan could now be added to the new Parish Council website as was just being set-up: [www.broughton-parish-council.org.uk](http://www.broughton-parish-council.org.uk)

Cllr. Mrs. Bull kindly agreed to lead in convening the inaugural meeting, which was to be on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2013.

### **13/6885**

**CORRESPONDENCE.** The following items of correspondence were reported and action, as detailed, was agreed to be taken, with other general items being placed on circulation:-

- a) A letter from the County Council, advising of the continuation of the tree-pack initiative once more this year.
- b) A consultation notification received from Kettering Borough Council, concerning a proposal for the introduction of a Dog Control Order affecting those eight cemeteries under Borough control (including at Broughton), and seeking to ensure dogs brought within those cemeteries are restrained on leads of no more than 1.5metres in length (ie non-extending leads only). Members discussed the proposal briefly and agreed to support the Order being suggested.
- c) A copy of the '50 Plus' newsletter had been received and was placed on circulation.
- d) A copy of the agenda for the meeting of the Rural Forum to be held on 27 June was placed on circulation. Councillors noted this did not include an item of business to consider the five year housing land supply issue as had been previously agreed by the Forum and a related issue as the accuracy of the proposed minutes of the previous meeting seemed likely to be pursued.

**13/6886**

**REPORTS OF MEMBERS ATTENDING MEETINGS OF OTHER BODIES.**

A report was made by the Chair of a conversation had with Mr P Horrix in connection with the proposed extension to St. Andrews Church. Members noted that Church representatives were to meet with officers of the Heritage Lottery Fund in July and, following this, a progress report will be submitted for consideration at the September meeting of the Parish Council.

The Chair then reported upon the meeting of the Village Hall Committee held on 11 June 2013, preceded by the Annual General Meeting of the Playing Fields and Village Hall Association. At the AGM, the constitution of the committee was agreed to remain unchanged; the papers for the meeting including accounts were placed on circulation. Business at the committee meeting included confirmation that the website was now being refreshed and would include details of the village show and hiring fee schedule. Plans continued to be developed to extend the hall and car park facilities, to include creation of a multi-sport area that should serve to enhance income. A work party was being organised to address weed growth immediately around the hall. A quantity of second-hand trestle tables had been acquired for use at events including the village show. New chairs were being sourced to improve facilities in the Meachem room. Finally, it had been reported that two incidents had occurred where rubbish bins had been removed and set alight in the pocket park.

A briefing was then given by the Chair arising from the meeting on 19 April with Highways representatives from MGWSP, and from resulting discussions. Notes containing the essence of this briefing are appended.

Members were then informed of a meeting held with officers of Kettering Borough Council on 24 May; the Chair, Cllr. Shrive and Cllr. Baxter meeting with Mr M Hammond and Mr R Harbour to consider key planning issues affecting the village. This was a positive meeting, with the Borough officers accepting that communications appeared to have broken down around the Redrow application, particularly in respect of the S106 obligations. A series of questions were fielded and answers to be confirmed (separate not appended of responses subsequently received). Consideration had been given to how best to progress the Neighbourhood Plan proposal, and discussion had also occurred in respect of the decline of the pocket park for want of volunteers, and the issue with insurance for the proposed Chapel event on the High Street recreation ground. Help with both seemed possible. An attempt to discuss the potential judicial review of the Redrow scheme had been made but this had been declined in the circumstances.

**13/6887**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL.**

**Planning Applications submitted for the Parish Council's observations:-**  
None reported.

**Planning Decisions notified:-**

The following Decision Notice was received, being a conditional approval:

Land off Cransley Hill Outline – up to 65 dwellings Redrow Homes

**Update on KET/2012/0709 (Cransley Hill) – S106 obligations and extension of time for completion:-**

Members heard that a draft of the proposed S106 Agreement had finally been disclosed by the Borough Council, but only mid-afternoon on 10 June; together with notification that completion was intended 'later today'. Immediate concerns had been registered that no effective consultation was being allowed, and initial observations had been lodged straight away, with more detailed comments/requested amendments following later the same evening/early the following morning. A significant number of fundamental and detailed points had been identified including as related to the content of the deed, its enforceability, the scope and nature of the obligations being required and the non-participation of the County Council as a party given certain obligations related to County delivers functions including education and highways improvements. Members had been copied with all relevant correspondence and were apprised of the detailed concerns identified.

By 17 June, it had still not been confirmed that completion of the S106 Agreement had occurred, and the Borough Council website was still that morning showing the application as awaiting determination; comments still being invited. Accordingly, enquiries had been made of the Borough and it had finally been ascertained the agreement was apparently completed on 10 June without any of the Parish concerns being addressed and the planning permission had been produced on 17 June despite earlier indications this was issued on 11 June. In fact, when received, the decision notice confirming the consent was dated 10 June 2013.

Given the previous concerns, and given these events, including the continuing doubts as to when the planning permission and planning obligations had legally been created, Councillors after some debate **RESOLVED** to instruct suitable counsel to review the events, correspondence and other key documents with a view to advising on the merits and prospects of a judicial review being commenced and succeeding so as to quash the planning permission purported to have been granted. A net budget of £1,500 for this work was allocated and the Clerk indicated the brief would be prepared and submitted as swiftly as possible where time was now an issue following the production of a decision notice. Discussion occurred as to the length of call and expertise of an appropriate barrister and it was agreed this could be delegated to the Clerk to decide after speaking with relevant chambers' clerks.

Arising from the many concerns around this issue, it was also proposed and agreed that the Leader and the relevant Portfolio Holder of the Borough Council should be invited to a future meeting of the Parish Council to explain how it has occurred that the five year supply issue has been allowed to develop to the point where established and policy protected village boundaries are impotent against speculative housing proposals.

The meeting then considered the current Gypsy and Traveller site consultation, and it was agreed that the assessment methodology being employed by the Borough Council was opaque. The issue of Highcroft Farm, as described earlier, was extremely concerning; this concern being known to be shared by Pytchley parish too. It was accordingly agreed that further awareness raising needed to occur in Broughton and,

given the Borough Council were not willing to run an exhibition in the village, it was suggested the display material be borrowed for an event to be run by the Parish Council to which Pytchley and Walgrave representatives could be invited.

In terms of the Parish Council response to the consultation, Cllr. Mrs Bull had kindly agreed to co-ordinate this, and the same would be considered further at the meeting to be held on 1 July.

**13/6888**

**FINANCE.** The following items of income and expenditure were noted/agreed:-

<b>Income</b>			<b>£</b>
No income was noted.			
<b>Expenditure</b>			<b>£</b>
GA Duthie	Salary and WP	(101555 )	250.33
HMRC	Income tax	(101556 )	141.20
GA Duthie	Electricity	(101557 )	4.24
GA Duthie	Website set-up initial costs	(101558 )	16.76
Brtn PF&VH Assn.	Refurb/improvements grant	(101559 )	2,000.00

Members then received and considered Accounting Statements for the financial year to 31 March 2013 (copies appended) and, after opportunity for questions, **RESOLVED** to approve the same having specifically considered all of the questions raised in the annual governance statement at Section 2 of the pro-forma. The same were accordingly then signed by the Chair, and by the Clerk as Responsible Financial Officer.

**13/6889**

**BROUGHTON POCKET PARK.** Members heard that the growing season was no in full swing with the consequence that vegetation was becoming very over-grown. The wildflower area was suffering especially, with incursion of oilseed rape from neighbouring arable land. Members agreed the new website afforded an opportunity to promote the project one last time but, if this failed to rejuvenate interest, then a decision as to the continuation of the management agreement would need to be made given the liabilities that result. The matter to be an agenda item for September.

**13/6890**

**GENERAL INTEREST ITEMS.** Cllr. Perkins briefed members that a hosting arrangement had been entered into with Zen Internet, and a skeleton site created that could be expanded to accommodate all likely parish council content.

Cllr. Mrs. Cope enquired whether any result had been declared for the best village competition; not yet.

Cllr. Mrs. Bull reported that horses were again being ridden through the Podmore Way pedestrian accesses. Cllr. Mrs. Chester agreed to speak informally with those concerned as to the dangers.

Cllr. Baxter confirmed a replacement for the vandal damaged tree in High Street recreation ground will be planted by the Borough Council in the autumn.

Cllr. Shrive mentioned the current issue with grass overgrowth all around the village.

The Chair confirmed this included at the Church Green.

Cllr. Gordon reported that the hedge at the Yeoman House on High Street was badly overgrown.

**13/6891**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING.** It was reported that the next scheduled meeting of the Parish Council would be on Wednesday 17 July 2013, at 7:00pm in the Village Hall.

**13/6892**

**URGENT ITEMS ADMITTED BY THE CHAIR.** None were raised.

*The meeting was closed at 9:55pm*

17 July 2013

Signed.....

Further to the meeting between representatives of Northamptonshire Highways and the Parish Council on Friday 19th April I confirm the following issues were discussed and below are my updates / actions on the points raised for possible funding from 106 monies:

- The Parish Council preferred the option of a change of priorities to a roundabout at the junction of High Street / Cransley Hill as this would result in the loss of fewer parking spaces in the area. It was confirmed that the parking bay by the CoOp should be extended with the existing post box relocated to alongside the shop
- Between Cransley Hill and Ivydene Terrace the possibility of introducing a section of parking restriction to help formalise parking will be investigated and the relocation of one of the vehicle activated signs from the Northampton Road to near the Park area was requested.
- At the Northampton Road / Wellingborough Road junction a roundabout was considered the most effective measure which, if possible, would incorporate a refuge island to assist pedestrians crossing the Wellingborough Road. Speed cushions remained the favoured option in reducing vehicle speeds along Northampton Road.
- It was agreed that the small pull in area outside the old pub by Cox's Lane should be infilled with kerb to prevent parked vehicles blocking visibility at the junction.

The Parish Council has carried out consultations with residents with regard to introducing a 30 minute waiting restriction for the CoOp lay-by and also for 'no parking at any time' restrictions at the Cox's Lane / High Street junction. These will be passed to Northamptonshire Highways Parking Officer for inclusion in the next batch of parking orders for the Kettering area later towards the end of the year. A request was also made for the refurbishment of the 'I' bar marking across the access to Dawkins Court and this has been passed onto our maintenance team.

The issue of the provision of a handrail along the Bank, Kettering Road was discussed and whilst it would be possible to mount railings here it would be expensive and would not be a priority for Highways funding. There may also be objections from residents as it would restrict access to their vehicles, it was agreed that since the streetlight had been turned back on this has become less of an issue.

One of the maintenance issues raised was flooding of the High Street in the vicinity of Cransley Hill, our maintenance colleagues reported back the following "We have attended to flooding on the High Street on a couple occasions and followed up with routine emptying and jetting. Although there is one drain that is a 'slow runner', there are no major issues with the highways drains in the area and the flooding experienced was due to the significant amounts of rainfall we experienced over the winter".

The second maintenance issue raised was the condition of the highway in certain areas of the village, although visually it doesn't look good it would be unlikely to meet the criteria for any works other than minor patching. The parish can contact Ben Wright At MGWSP [bwright@mgwsp.co.uk](mailto:bwright@mgwsp.co.uk) <<mailto:bwright@mgwsp.co.uk>> if they have any particular areas that they consider especially bad and he may look into the possibilities of patching certain areas but there are no plans in place for any resurfacing works within the village this financial year.

At the meeting there was some confusion as to the receipt of a drawing of the original proposals that was sent to the Parish Council in July 2012 so I have attached a further copy for your reference and I will arrange for an updated drawing, with the revisions discussed above to be forwarded over to you within the next few weeks for the Parish's comments.

Regards

Ian Boyes 24 April 2013

### **Cox's Lane/High Street junction**

I enclose a plan for the works at Cox's Lane/High Street junction. The scheme comprises kerbing out the redundant layby and installing bollards to ensure the area remains free of parking. The feasibility price for this scheme is £7340.34 inc overheads. This estimate excludes any unforeseen circumstances, utility protection/diversion etc.

### **Cransley Hill – Change of Priority**

I have reviewed the site at Cransley Hill for a change in priority and have the following concerns.

- In order to comply with the visibility requirements of DMRB, the yield line on High Street will need to be positioned within the vehicular access for Dawkins Court. Although less, the requirements under Manual for Streets 2 has almost the same impact on the positioning of the yield line due to the close proximity of 46 High Street to the carriageway.
- The resulting kerb line will reduce forward visibility of motorists turning left into Cransley Hill from the High Street to below the minimum requirements and will also put vehicles into conflict with other vehicles travelling along Cransley Hill as either attempts to negotiate parked vehicles.
- The change in road classification from an old trunk road type road to a much more narrow unclassified road may be too severe for motorists heading north along the High Street and into Cransley Hill unimpeded.
- Due to Cransley Hill being the minor route with less traffic exiting onto High Street (and the poor visibility up Cransley Hill), motorists heading north along High Street may be tempted make their decision early and dart across prior to being able to see if their passage is going to be clear which could result in collisions.

I would therefore suggest that a change in priority is not implemented at this location. If you would like to discuss this in more detail please let me know.

### **Mini Roundabout and Pedestrian Refuge island Wellingborough Rd/Northampton Rd Junction**

I have included within the design the Pedestrian Refuge Island at the Wellingborough Road junction. This will require additional kerbing works on the north-eastern side to facilitate vehicles turning into Wellingborough Road. Even with the kerbing alterations turning movements for HGV's and large farm machinery will not be achievable due to close proximity of the vehicular access and the need to put the pedestrian refuge on the desire line. There is however a weight limit of 7.5T (except for access) in place some 400 yards from the junction which should minimise the need for these vehicles to require this movement

Further to my email yesterday, please find below a list of the queries that you and your fellow councillors raised at our meeting and our response in relation to them:

### **Cransley Hill Planning Application**

**Q:** Could you provide a list of S106 elements for the Cox's Lane development and how the various contributions will actually be utilised?

**Response:** The S106 agreement for this development is now fully set out in detail and a copy of this has been forwarded to Gary Duthie. Hopefully the content of the agreement will provide the answers you are looking for, but if anything requires further clarification, please let me know and I'll seek a more detailed explanation from officer colleagues.

**Q:** Can you explain the rationale for roundabout vs. traffic lights at junction of Cransley Hill and High St?. (Parish Councillors and residents are concerned about loss of parking spaces, and suggestions about perhaps changing priorities for traffic movements instead.)

**Response:** The wording of the S106 in relation to this is intended to allow for flexibility as to providing works which would best improve the junction. As the Highway Authority, the County Council will need to be satisfied that whatever solution is implemented will satisfactorily mitigate the effect of the development on the local highway infrastructure.

**Q:** Whose proposal is the pond and what is its purpose?

**Response:** The proposed development requires a balancing pond for the drainage of the site. This type of drainage solution is now commonplace as it enables the drainage to be dealt without increasing the load on the existing public sewer infrastructure. This is therefore a necessary feature in creating a sustainable development. (For your further information, Condition 18 refers to drainage.)

**Q:** Why does NCC feel there is enough highway capacity for this development?

**Response:** NCC assess planning applications using TRICS modelling data and the professional expert judgement of their officers. In this instance, their assessment concludes that the proposal is acceptable once the measures set out through the conditions and S106 etc. have been implemented.

**Q:** Why was the S106 deadline such a short one initially?

**Response:** At the time, there was no reason to believe that the deadline would be too short.

however further consultation with adjacent farms/businesses will have to be carried out to ensure these works do not have a negative impact on their business.

The feasibility cost for this scheme including the mini roundabout and Refuge Island will be £76,184.97 inc overheads. This estimate excludes any unforeseen circumstances, utility protection/diversion etc.

The main issue raised are the concerns regarding the introduction of a change of priorities at the Cransley Hill junction which the engineer recommends reverting back to the original roundabout option indicated on the attached 'Broughton Traffic Calming Feasibility Drawing'. I understand that the Parish Council had concerns that the roundabout option would reduce parking in this area but it is considered, that with further investigation, we may be able to alter this roundabout option slightly to provide some additional parking.

To discuss this further, and also to also look at the St Andrews Way Junction

*Enlarging lay-by outside Co-Op.  
Speed calming in Wellingborough Rd.*

## **Planning / Neighbourhood Planning**

**Q: Can you signpost us to possible funding sources for neighbourhood planning work?**

**Response:** The best place to start looking is on the My Community Rights website. The following link will take you to a webpage that has information about possible funding: <http://mycommunityrights.org.uk/neighbourhood-planning/>

**Q: Boundary issues – can you advise on how settlement boundary issues are to be treated in existing planning regime?**

**Response:** Kettering Borough Council is in the process of reviewing its village boundaries, through the preparation of policies contained within the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document. A significant amount of survey work has been undertaken in the review of policies, including a consultation in March 2012 providing options for growth. Broughton Parish Council will continue to be an important consultee in advancing the policies to be contained within the document.

**Q. What is the impact of a shortfall in the five year housing land supply?**

**Response:** In terms of the five year housing land supply, paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that Local Plans should meet assessed housing needs. At paragraph 47, it requires that local planning authorities should identify a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, with an additional buffer of 5% or 20%. Paragraph 49 states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. This was a contributory factor leading to the planning application for residential development at Cransley Hill, Broughton being granted consent recently. The Borough Council is working hard on a number of fronts to ensure that it can rely upon a five year housing land supply in the future. If it can demonstrate a five year supply, it will help the Council to determine applications for residential development in line with local policy, thereby protecting the status of the village boundary as a barrier to development.

**Q: Please can you supply the contact details of the planner that has assisted Rothwell with neighbourhood planning?**

**Response:** The persons name is Tony Boswell, his email address is [tboswell@metronet.co.uk](mailto:tboswell@metronet.co.uk). The Borough Council would however advise that in the first instance, the Parish Council may find it more useful to contact Locality, who are well placed to offer you advice on neighbourhood planning. They can be contacted on: Tel. 0845 458 8366, email. [info@locality.org.uk](mailto:info@locality.org.uk)

**Q: The Parish Council were not aware of consultation being carried out when the two recent permissions at Broughton traveller site were approved?**

**Response: We are unsure which two recent permissions you are referring to. The last application which was approved by Kettering Borough Council was on the 20/06/12. A letter consulting the Parish Council was sent out on 19/09/2011. Please see link below to details of the application <http://www.kettering.gov.uk/planningApplication/99846>.**

**Please could you provide us with further information to enable us to identify which two permissions you are referring to.**

**I hope the above information answers all of your questions. Should you need any further information please do come back to me.**

**Regards  
Rob**

## Section 1 – Accounting statements 2012/13 for

Readers should note that throughout this annual return references to a 'local council' or 'council' also relate to a parish meeting.

1	Balances brought forward	10920	11501	Total balances and reserves at the beginning of the year as recorded in the financial records. Value must agree to Box 7 of previous year.
2	(+) Annual precept	10940	10830	Total amount of precept received or receivable in the year.
3	(+) Total other receipts	4	4	Total income or receipts as recorded in the cashbook less the precept received (line 2). Include any grants received here.
4	(-) Staff costs	4483	4562	Total expenditure or payments made to and on behalf of all employees. Include salaries and wages, PAYE and NI (employees and employers), pension contributions and employment expenses.
5	(-) Loan interest/capital repayments	NIL	NIL	Total expenditure or payments of capital and interest made during the year on the council's borrowings (if any).
6	(-) All other payments	5880	4629	Total expenditure or payments as recorded in the cashbook less staff costs (line 4) and loan interest/capital repayments (line 5).
7	(=) Balances carried forward	11501	13144	Total balances and reserves at the end of the year. Must equal (1+2+3) – (4+5+6)
8	Total cash and short term investments	11501	13144	The sum of all current and deposit bank accounts, cash holdings and short term investments held as at 31 March – to agree with bank reconciliation.
9	Total fixed assets plus other long term investments and assets	1	1	The original Asset and Investment Register value of all fixed assets, plus other long term assets owned by the council as at 31 March
10	Total borrowings	NIL	NIL	The outstanding capital balance as at 31 March of all loans from third parties (including PWLB).
11	(If Applicable) Trust funds (including charitable) disclosure note	✓	✓	(if applicable) The council acts as sole trustee for and is responsible for managing trust funds or assets. (Readers should note that the figures in the accounting statements above do not include any trust transactions.)

I certify that for the year ended 31 March 2013 the accounting statements in this annual return present fairly the financial position of the council and its income and expenditure, or properly present receipts and payments, as the case may be.

Signed by Responsible Financial Officer

Date

19/6/2013

I confirm that these accounting statements were approved by the council on this date:

19 June 2013

and recorded as minute reference:

13/6888

Signed by Chair of the meeting approving these accounting statements

Date

19 June 2013

## Section 2 – Annual governance statement 2012/13

We acknowledge as the members of:

our responsibility for ensuring that there is a sound system of internal control, including the preparation of the accounting statements. We confirm, to the best of our knowledge and belief, with respect to the accounting statements for the year ended 31 March 2013, that:

- |   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | We approved the accounting statements prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Accounts and Audit Regulations and proper practices.   | ✓ | prepared its accounting statements in the way prescribed by law.   |
| 2 | We maintained an adequate system of internal control, including measures designed to prevent and detect fraud and corruption <b>and</b> reviewed its effectiveness.  | ✓ | made proper arrangements and accepted responsibility for safeguarding the public money and resources in its charge.  |
| 3 | We took all reasonable steps to assure ourselves that there are no matters of actual or potential non-compliance with laws, regulations and codes of practice that could have a significant financial effect on the ability of the council to conduct its business or on its finances. | ✓ | has only done things that it has the legal power to do and has conformed to codes of practice and standards in the way it has done so.                                       |
| 4 | We provided proper opportunity during the year for the exercise of electors' rights in accordance with the requirements of the Accounts and Audit Regulations.   | ✓ | during the year has given all persons interested the opportunity to inspect and ask questions about the council's accounts.  |
| 5 | We carried out an assessment of the risks facing the council <b>and</b> took appropriate steps to manage those risks, including the introduction of internal controls and/or external insurance cover where required.  | ✓ | considered the financial and other risks it faces and has dealt with them properly.  |
| 6 | We maintained throughout the year an adequate and effective system of internal audit of the council accounting records and control systems.  | ✓ | arranged for a competent person, independent of the financial controls and procedures, to give an objective view on whether internal controls meet the needs of the council. |
| 7 | We took appropriate action on all matters raised in reports from internal and external audit.  | ✓ | responded to matters brought to its attention by internal and external audit.  |
| 8 | We considered whether any litigation, liabilities or commitments, events or transactions, occurring either during or after the year-end, have a financial impact on the council and, where appropriate have included them in the accounting statements.                                | ✓ | disclosed everything it should have about its business activity during the year including events taking place after the year-end if relevant.                                |
| 9 | Trust funds (including charitable) – in our capacity as the sole managing trustee we discharged our responsibility in relation to the accountability for the fund(s)/assets, including financial reporting <b>and</b> , if required, independent examination or audit.                 | ✓ | has met all of its responsibilities where it is a sole managing trustee of a local trust or trusts.  |

This annual governance statement is approved by the council and recorded as minute reference

dated 13/6888  
19 June 2013

Signed by:

Chair *Mick Hunt*  
dated 19 June 2013

Signed by:

Clerk *Lois*  
dated 19/6/2013

**\*Note:** Please provide explanations to the external auditor on a separate sheet for each 'No' response. Describe how the council will address the weaknesses identified.