THURSLEY PARISH COUNCIL Minutes of Meeting

Tuesday 2nd May 2017 at 7.30 pm Thursley Village Hall, Thursley

Attendees: Cllr J. Mendelssohn (Chair) Cllr T. Horwood Cllr P. Hunter

Cllr J. Luff Cllr J. Malton Cllr J. Swift

Mrs E. Felton (Clerk)

Also attending were: Cllr D. Harmer (SCC) Cllr D. Else (WBC) Cllr J. Else (WBC)

Mrs N. Bates Mr N. Chandler Ms D. Mills Mr M. Patrick Mr R. Bryson Mrs C. Beechey

Mrs J. Sherratt

1.0 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Following a nomination and voting process, it was declared that Cllr Mendelssohn be re-elected as Chairman.

2.0 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Following a nomination process, it was declared that Cllr Hunter be elected as Vice Chairman.

3.0 DECLARATIONS OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE

Cllr Mendelssohn signed his Declaration of Acceptance of Office form following his appointment as Chairman. The Clerk countersigned the declaration.

4.0 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Clerk reported that apologies had been received Cllr Sean Edwards who was absent due to personal commitments. These apologies were accepted by the Council.

5.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No members disclosed any (a) Personal, (b) Prejudicial interests which they are required to disclose by section 94(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 and in accordance with The Parish Council (Model Code of Conduct) Order 2007.

6.0 APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES AND OTHER BODIES

Following review of the 'Appointment of Member to Committees and Other Bodies' list for 2016-17, minor amendments for 2017-18 were agreed. **The Clerk was asked to amend and distribute the new version.**

7.0 APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the Parish Council meeting on 4th April 2017 were approved by the Council and signed by the Chairman.

8.0 MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES

(8.1) It was noted that Cllr David Else had informed Councillors that the maximum number of homes on Warren Park was fifty one. Cllr Luff advised that he was still waiting to hear back from Highways England following the recent site meeting. Cllr Jenny Else advised why it had not been possible for a WBC to be present at the meeting.

The Clerk was asked to write to Highways England to request an update in advance of the June Parish Council meeting.

9.0 COUNTY COUNCILLOR AND BOROUGH COUNCILLOR REPORTS

- (9.1) Cllr Harmer advised that there was nothing to report.
- (9.2) Cllr Jenny Else advised that following concerns raised regarding the response/travel times for stroke patients to travel to Frimley Park hospital instead of the Royal Surrey hospital, she had brokered a meeting with Mr Jeremy Hunt MP, SECAMB and other interested parties to discuss the matter. She advised that the outcome of this meeting was that SECAMB had agreed to undertake a study of response times and to report back at the next planned meeting in July.

Cllr Jenny Else explained that she had written a letter on behalf of the residents of Waverley as a response to the public consultation that had taken place regarding the change in arrangements for treatment of stroke patients. She advised that she would provide Councillors with a copy of her letter.

Discussion took place regarding the need to move the specialist stroke centre to Frimley Park. It was noted that it was better for patients to travel further to be treated at a centre of excellence but that this did put increased pressure on the ambulance service to ensure travel times are minimised.

Cllr Jenny Else explained that if treatment for stroke patients is received within the first four hours, the outcome was good. She advised that stroke patients should always be taken to hospital by ambulance rather than by their own transport to ensure appropriate treatment by trained professionals during the travel time and to ensure that they were fast-tracked through the A&E reception process.

Cllr Jenny Else was thanked for her hard work in highlighting this issue and responding on behalf of residents. It was noted that it may be appropriate to include the information in the parish magazine.

(9.3) Cllr Jenny Else advised that the Village Design Statement was taken into account by WBC as part of the planning decision making process but that other national regulations and policies may apply and thus negate local objections. It was noted that planning law takes precedence.

Discussion took place regarding the benefit of WBC adopting locally prepared documents. It was confirmed that Village Design Statements are part of the process but that national policy may conflict with the content. Cllr David Else advised that there may be a need for more specific detail to be included in the document for consideration by applicants and their agents.

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

It was noted that the majority of members of the public attending the meeting were interested in discussions regarding the Parish Field. It was agreed to move agenda item 16) forward for discussion following Public Question Time.

Mrs Nicki Bates asked if it was still an option for a book library in the telephone box. It was suggested that the books would deteriorate due to moisture.

In advance of members of the public speaking regarding the Parish Field, Cllr Mendelssohn provided an overview of the discussions to date. He advised that he had been impressed with the healthy debate which the suggestion had prompted and the number of letters, calls and emails which he had received. It was noted that on balance there appeared to be a majority against the proposal for the land swap. He emphasized that the Parish Council were genuinely open to comments.

Mr Nigel Chandler referenced his two recent emails to Parish Councillors on the subject of the land swap. He suggested that the decision about which option to take should be deferred to allow for further publicising of the proposal to a wider audience. It was noted that it was the seller of the land who needed to apply for the land to be deregulated as common land. It was suggested that a possible option was not to deregulate the land and thus minimise the possibility of development.

A query was raised about whether the workshop on Natural England land had been erected following deregulation of the common land. It was suggested that this may have taken place prior to the 2006 Act.

Ms Dene Mills advised that the parish field should not change ownership and that WBC would not be looking to develop within the village so why should the site be highlighted as a possibility. Cllr Mendelssohn advised that as reported by Mr Chandler, WBC had confirmed that Thursley was not 'on the radar' for development plans at present but that as per a recent radio article, there may be pressure for development in the village in the future. Ms Mills commented that there were sufficient brownfield sites available to meet demand.

Cllr Mendelssohn advised that although WBC had no plans at present, the scenario had been suggested to afford the village some protection in the future should the relevant planning policy protections currently in place (e.g. AONB etc.) be relaxed. He suggested that in the future if development should be considered in the village, it may be better if there was an alternative site to offer in place of other, less suitable options. It was noted that there had been a site put forward for speculative development of a field adjoining Dye House Road for 414 houses in the past.

Cllr Malton advised that there was no infrastructure within the village to support further development and that the land was outside of the settlement area which would result in pressure to infill if the site were developed. It was agreed that as the land was outside of the settlement, development was highly unlikely as many constraints would need to be changed.

Mr Patrick stated that the status quo should be maintained and that arrangements should stay exactly as they are at present unless Natural England intended to sell the land but it was noted that they were not interested in doing so. It was noted that it would make no difference who owned the parish field. Mr Patrick advised that the role of the Parish Council was not to act as development land owners.

Discussion took place regarding the rights of parishioners to use the field. It was noted that the field was considered to be toxic due to previous use as a sewage dump.

Mr Patrick commented that he was against the proposal and that capital gains tax may need to be considered if the proposal proceeds. He queried why the Chairman had begun discussions with Natural England.

Cllr Hunter advised that he had been involved in the initial discussion some three years earlier when he was Chairman, when considering whether the Parish Council should prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. He advised that the previous discussions were the catalyst for considering what sites could be put forward for development at that time but that Natural England had recently raised the subject again.

Mrs Clea Beechey advised that she was against the proposal due to the historical aspect of the parish field and that there was a presumption that there was demand for development in the village when she did not consider this to be the case. She commented that if the proposal were to take place there may be a suggestion that the field abutting the land also be developed which would not be acceptable. Mrs Beechey asked for clarification regarding the suggestion that the village hall be built on the site. Cllr Mendelssohn clarified his previous comment that if such a proposal were to result in funding for the village, it may contribute towards rebuilding/maintenance of the village hall on its current site.

Mr Rob Bryson stated that if the assumption is that the majority view is that further development is not needed, it is illogical to identify sites for use. He advised that by highlighting the possibility, the site may be considered as an option whereas it would be better for it not to be visible and open for consideration.

Mrs Jenni Sherratt commented that the Parish Council should not create a fall-back position.

Cllr Mendelssohn referenced a comment made by Mrs Patricia Coles regarding the alternative site of Tweedsmuir which was owned by the MOD and not used. It was noted that wherever development was suggested to take place, there would be a group of people not supportive of the plans.

End of Public Question Time

Ms Mills and Mr Patrick left the meeting – 8.30 pm.

Cllr Mendelssohn advised that Councillors would now discuss the proposal taking into account the previous comments. He outlined the options available to Councillors which included leaving as is, pursuing the land swap further, revisit the proposal in an agreed period of time or investigate the possibility of an agreement with Natural England to have an option to proceed at some point in the future, should the need arise.

Cllr Hunter advised that he had sympathy with all views expressed and that he would be agreeable to investigating the option scenario with Natural England. Cllr Horwood agreed with Cllr Hunter in that the action should be to investigate if an 'option for the future' is viable.

Cllr Swift advised that he is supportive of affordable development in the village but understands the views of parishioners and that given the comments, he would support investigation of an option with Natural England but would also be happy for no further action.

Cllr Luff advised that he appreciated the sentiments of villagers for the parish field but that nothing would change if the proposal went ahead. He supported the investigation into an option with Natural England and not to do the land swap.

Cllr Malton advised that she proposed that the land swap should not go ahead and that she did not support the option suggestion.

It was noted that Cllr Mendelssohn had spoken with Cllr Edwards regarding the proposal and that he had advised that he would support the 'option for the future' suggestion.

In light of the comments from the six Councillors present, It was approved by a majority vote that further discussion with Natural England take place to determine whether they were open to the idea of a 'first option' on the land in the future if they were to consider selling it. It was agreed that Cllr Mendelssohn and Cllr Malton would be involved in these discussions. The decision regarding the land swap was deferred until these discussions had taken place.

Cllr Mendelssohn thanked the members of the public for their interest and input.

Mrs Beechey, Mr Brydon, Mr Chandler and Mrs Sherratt left the meeting at 8.45 pm.

10.0 PLANNING

(10.1) It was noted that the retrospective planning application for the black cladding on Dell Cottage has been approved by WBC. Discussion took place regarding the background to the application, conditions attached to the original application and the subsequent enforcement process. Cllr Mendelssohn commented that he understood that the applicant had now complied and that the building was lawful but he was concerned about the rationale for the decision and the precedent which may be set.

Following discussion Cllr Mendelssohn agreed to write a letter to Elizabeth Sims, Head of Planning at WBC, to highlight the concerns of the Parish Council regarding the danger of setting a precedent for future applications which may follow the same route.

- (10.2) Cllr Jenny Else advised that the Parish Council could request planning applications to be 'called in' to be considered at Committee level and that there was no need for objections to be in place prior to the request being directed to her.
- (10.3) It was confirmed that the Parish Council response to the appeal consultation for Hindhead Hill Farm had been registered by the deadline date and that it was now necessary to await the outcome.
- (10.4) It was noted that the planning application for Kestrel Woods had been refused.

11.0 FINANCE

(11.1) The following financial overview for May was presented, duly authorised and the cheques for payment were approved and signed:

PAYMENTS: May (and March)

954	Help in Thursley	250.00	Contribution (paid 31st March)
955	Imperative Training	1671.60	Defibrillator purchase
956	Hill House Farm Partnership	5560.66	Recreation ground works
952	E. Felton	281.50	Salary & Expenses
953	The Post Office	173.20	HMRC payment

TOTAL £7,936.96

(11.2) The Clerk reported that the cheque no. 954 had been prepared to be included as a payment from the 2016-17 budget.

(11.3) It was noted that it may be necessary to prepare an additional cheque in advance of the June meeting to pay for costs associated with installation of the defibrillator at Pitch Place. The Clerk advised that she had received advice that the cheque for funding the unit was due from Billmeir Trust shortly.

(11.4) Budget review

The budget review document for 2016-17 was reviewed by Councillors. It was noted that the year-end bank balance included £4,800 for the balance of the works to the recreation ground. It was also noted that the rent amount of £564 from Natural England for the Parish Field had not been received during the year. The Clerk explained that this was because the 2016-17 amount had been received in March 2016 and the 2017-18 amount had been received in April 2017.

(11.5) Cllr Mendelssohn advised that the coach company responsible for the damage to the green in Bowlhead Green had agreed to pay for the repair works and that Cllr Swift had obtained a quote and the work had been completed.

(11.6) Remembrance book

Following previous discussion regarding the suggestion that it was appropriate to purchase remembrance books, the Clerk was asked to purchase two books at an approx. cost of £49 each from a supplier previously identified.

12.0 HIGHWAYS

- (12.1) Cllr Mendelssohn advised that following a reminder regarding the actions agreed at a meeting, Highways England had provided him with a signage plan to be implemented for planned closures of the Hindhead tunnel. It was suggested that this plan would improve the traffic problems experienced in the village but that its effectiveness would continue to be monitored. In response to a question regarding when the number of planned closures are likely to reduce, it was noted that Highways England had said that there were unlikely to be any further planned closures
- (12.2) Cllr Hunter asked when the road subsidence problem on Highfield Road by Copper Beeches would be repaired. Cllr Harmer advised that costs had been agreed for the works during the current financial year. It was noted that SCC workmen had been seen photographing the area in recent weeks which suggested that work was imminent but that it may still be necessary for the problem to be regularly reported.
- (12.3) Cllr Mendelssohn advised that he had been approached by a concerned parishioner regarding the speed of vehicles on The Street and Highfield Lane. He asked when the repeater signs which had been approved were likely to be installed on Highfield Lane and whether it was necessary to end the 20 MPH zone as traffic enters The Street. Cllr Mendelssohn and Cllr Harmer agreed to take a look at the current signage and report back.

13.0 RECREATION GROUND

It was reported that the parking arrangements on the recreation ground had been greatly improved following installation of the new access track. However there had been concerns raised with Councillors regarding the use of the area by commercial dog walkers and other commercial organisations which had resulted in a parishioner with young children being intimidated. Cllr Malton advised that she is familiar with one local dog walking service and they are extremely responsible and considerate of other users.

Discussion took place regarding the problems associated with parking and other activities on the recreation ground. It was suggested that more appropriate signage should be erected to deter inappropriate use of the area. The Clerk was asked to speak to neighbouring parishes to see if they have signs in place which are effective. Councillors agreed to consider the wording to inform further discussion at the next meeting.

14.0 THURSLEY VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT

It was noted that Cllr Swift had prepared a draft addendum to the VDS. **Cllr Hunter advised that** he had some comments which he would sent to Cllr Swift for review.

Cllr Swift advised that in light of recent comments regarding the content detail and perceived use of the document, it may be appropriate for a discussion to take place with WBC Planning prior to completion and adoption. Cllr Mendelssohn agreed to include reference to the proposed VDS update and request a meeting as part of his letter to Elizabeth Sims.

15.0 HAMMER POND

Cllr Mendelssohn advised that he had been informed that the options for Natural England to reinstate the historical Hammer pond had been reduced to 2-3 and passed to the main Board of Directors for consideration taking into account the associated costs. It was envisaged that a final response would be available shortly but Cllr Mendelssohn would continue to chase. Cllr Luff provided details of the costs involved in the pumps already on site.

16.0 PARISH FIELD

See Public Question Time and discussion above.

17.0 BOATS

Cllr Mendelssohn reported that there were on-going problems associated with misuse of BOAT's within the parish with recent complaints regarding damage in High Button. He advised that a report was being prepared by a parishioner which may challenge the legal position of land owners to accept responsibility and repair the damage.

18.0 ANNUAL ASSEMBLY

On behalf of the Parish Councillors, Cllr Mendelssohn apologised to Cllrs Jenny and David Else for the outburst at the meeting by Mr Robert Ranson. It was agreed that this was totally unacceptable and although an open meeting, attendees need to be mindful that is it not acceptable to make such inappropriate comments.

It was agreed that feedback from the event had been good although it was noted that there was still a need to consider how to attract younger parishioners to attend. It was suggested a Sunday afternoon fun event may be appropriate. **Councillors were asked to consider in advance of 2018.**

19.0 EMERGENCY PLAN

The Clerk outlined discussions that had taken three years previously regarding the preparation of a parish Emergency Plan and the process by which Elstead had recently approached the collation of an Emergency Group and Parish Council Emergency Plan. The Clerk was asked to provide Cllr Malton and Cllr Horwood with details so that they could investigate the options available and report back to members.

20.0 VILLAGE OF THE YEAR

It was agreed that the village would not participate in the television programme to identify the village of the year.

21.0 CORRESPONDENCE

The Clerk reported that all correspondence had already been shared with Councillors.

22.0 MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION AT NEXT MEETING

- Items carried forward from above.
- Approval of annual accounts
- Budget for Bowlhead Green Pond

Signed	6 th June 2017
	Date of next meeting is Tuesday 6 th June 2017 at 7.30 pm.
	The meeting closed at 10.10 pm

Activity April May April May August September April October Activity Activity Activity Activity Activity Activity April October	Thursley Parish Council						RECEIF	PTS/EXPEND	ITURE RE	VIEW BY I	MONTH 20	16-17					
April May June July August September April October November December Junuary Fabruary March Oct Har 2017 TOTAL 2016.17 TOTAL 201															FORECAST		
Common C																Forecast 2016-17	Original Budget
Interest Discharges 1,489,50	Activity	April	May	June	July	August	September	Apr -Sep 2016	October	November	December	January	February	March	Oct - Mar 2017		
Interest Discharges 1,489,50	Grant Aid	£90 00						£90 00				£8,000,00			£8,000,00	£8 090 00	£110.00
Processor Proc		200.00										20,000.00			,	,	2110.00
Electricity 1,000		£14 887 00															£14 887 00
December Compound		211,001100															211,001100
Compensation Grant																	
Lead Support Grost		£310.00							£310.00								£690.00
Refunction																	
VAF Post Continuement Page 50			£551.00	£100.00													
Pellicia Insulance moreses Pellicia Insulance P																	£4,224,30
Parish Find Stort VOS States			,						£154.13						£154.13	£154.13	£400.00
VIDS Selects																	
Total Receipts																	
HANKC	Total Receipts	£15,287.00	£3,520.50	£100.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00		£464.13	£0.00	£0.00	£8,000.00	£0.00	£0.00			£20,875.30
MARIC \$168.00 \$169.00 \$169.0	Salaries	£254.40	£254.40	£254.40	£254.40	£254.40	£254.40	£1,526.40	£254.40	£254.40	£254.40	£254.40	£254.40	£284.40	£1,556.40	£3,082.80	£2,910.00
Clear Expenses E22 20 E22 20 E22 20 E22 20 E25 80 E22 20 E25 80 E22 20 E23 10 E22 20 E27 20 E27 00 E270 00	HMRC																
Persistan costs 100,00 10	Clerk Expenses	£22.20	£22.20	£22.20	£22.20	£15.00	£29.40	£133.20	£22.20	£25.80	£22.20	£23.10	£22.20	£22.20	£137.70	£270.90	£270.00
Grass-cuting Ease - SCAPTC	Pension costs							£0.00							£0.00	£200.00	£200.00
Fees - SCAPTC	Warden fee	£100.00						£100.00	£100.00						£100.00	£200.00	£200.00
Seminary	Grasscutting							£0.00	£500.00						£500.00	£500.00	£500.00
Insurance Preniums \$786.59 \$6.84.00 \$786.50 \$6.00 \$6	Fees - SCAPTC	£200.98						£200.98							£0.00	£200.98	£250.00
Playground Inspection fee	Grants/Payments		£100.00					£100.00						£250.00	£250.00	£350.00	£0.00
Admin Expenses	Insurance Premiums			£786.59				£786.59							£0.00	£786.59	£1,370.00
Admin Expenses	Playground inspection fee						£84.00	£84.00							£0.00	£84.00	£70.00
Audit Fees	Admin Expenses							£0.00							£0.00	£0.00	£150.00
Internal Audit	Hall Facilities				£65.10			£65.10					£235.90		£235.90	£301.00	£500.00
Recreation Ground	Audit Fees						£200.00	£200.00							£0.00	£200.00	£320.00
Playground Furniture & Maintenance Ephfoliator & Expenses £225.00 £225	Internal Audit			£455.00				£455.00							£0.00	£455.00	£470.00
Delibrillator & Expenses	Recreation Ground		£551.00	£422.46				£973.46			£480.00			£4,000.00	£4,480.00	£5,453.46	£1,200.00
Village design statement	Playground Furniture & Maintenance								£70.50								
Election costs Election costs	Defibrillator & Expenses			£225.00				£225.00							£0.00	£225.00	£1,500.00
Village support costs Chere repenses £111.00 £25.60 £25.	Village design statement							£0.00							£0.00	£0.00	£1,000.00
Other expenses £111.00 £25.60	Election costs							£0.00							£0.00	£0.00	£1,000.00
Pavilion Rebuild costs Pavilion Rebuild costs Pavilion Rebuild costs Pavilion Rebuild costs Pavilion Rebuild costs Pavilion Rebuild costs Pavilion Rebuild costs Pavilion Rebuild costs Pavilion Rebuild costs Pavilion Rebuild Costs Pavilion Rebuild Rebuild Pavilion Rebuild	Village support costs							£0.00							£0.00	£0.00	£500.00
Donations E0.00	Other expenses	£111.00	£25.60					£136.60			£580.00				£580.00	£716.60	£1,000.00
Village Hall Sign Posts Description of the post of the	Pavilion Rebuild costs							£0.00							£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Sign Posts £0.00 £	Donations							£0.00							£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Training Pavilion costs Pavilion cost Pavilion Pavilio	Village Hall							£0.00							£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Pavilion costs Pavilion cost Pavilion co	Sign Posts																£0.00
\$137 payments	Training						£55.00							£40.00			£250.00
Vat on payments £110.20 £91.00 £67.80 £269.00 £6.10 £212.00 £808.00 £1,026.10 £1,026.10 £1,295.10 £1,000.00 Total Payments £858.18 £1,233.00 £2,426.25 £511.30 £439.00 £860.20 £6,327.93 £1,122.80 £449.80 £1,718.20 £447.10 £682.10 £5,594.20 £10,014.20 £16,542.13 £16,530.00 Opening Bank Balance £11,498.45		ļ															
Total Payments £858.18 £1,233.00 £2,426.25 £511.30 £439.00 £860.20 £6,327.93 £1,122.80 £449.80 £1,718.20 £447.10 £682.10 £5,594.20 £10,014.20 £16,542.13 £16,530.00 Opening Bank Balance £11,498.45 Bank Balance at month end £25,927.27 £28,214.77 £25,888.52 £25,377.22 £24,938.22 £24,078.02 £24,078.02 £23,419.35 £22,969.55 £21,251.35 £28,804.25 £28,122.15 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 Fire Fund (ring fenced) £2,923.00 £2,	s137 payments													<u> </u>			£0.00
Opening Bank Balance £11,498.45	Vat on payments		£110.20	£91.00			£67.80	£269.00	£6.10		£212.00			£808.00	£1,026.10	£1,295.10	£1,000.00
Opening Bank Balance £11,498.45	Total Payments	£858.18	£1,233.00	£2,426.25	£511.30	£439.00	£860.20	£6.327.93	£1,122.80	£449.80	£1,718.20	£447.10	£682.10	£5,594.20	£10.014.20	£16.542.13	£16.530.00
Bank Balance at month end £25,927.27 £28,214.77 £25,888.52 £25,377.22 £24,938.22 £24,078.02 £23,419.35 £22,969.55 £21,251.35 £28,804.25 £28,122.15 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £22,527.95 £23,00 £2,923.00			,	,	2211100	2111111		,100	,					,		,	
Fire Fund (ring fenced) Payments Play Area Fund (ring fenced) Payments Fine Fund (ring fenced) Fig. 923.00 Fig.	· •	,	£28.214.77	£25,888 52	£25.377.22	£24.938.22	£24.078.02	£24.078.02	£23,419,35	£22,969.55	£21,251 35	£28.804.25	£28,122,15	£22,527,95	£22,527 95	£22,527 95	
Payments Play Area Fund (ring fenced) £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70 £104.70	Zam Zaranoo at monar ond	~EV;VE1.E1		~=0,000.0E			,010.0Z	224,070.02	220,410.00	,000.00					222,027.30	22,021.00	
Receipts Payments	Fire Fund (ring fenced) Payments	£2,923.00	£2,923.00	£2,923.00	£2,923.00	£2,923.00	£2,923.00		£2,923.00	£2,923.00	£2,923.00	£2,923.00	£2,923.00	£2,923.00			
Payments	Play Area Fund (ring fenced) Receipts	£104.70	£104.70	£104.70	£104.70	£104.70	£104.70		£104.70	£104.70	£104.70	£104.70	£104.70	£104.70			
Bank balance inc. ring Fenced Amoun \$28,954,97 \$31,242,47 \$28,916,22 \$28,404,92 \$27,965,92 \$27,105,72 \$29,647,05 \$23,07,25 \$24,270,05 \$31,831,05 \$31,140,85 \$25,555,65	Payments																
	Bank balance inc. ring Fenced Amour	£28.954.97	£31.242.47	£28.916.22	£28,404,92	£27.965.92	£27,105,72		£26,447.05	£25,997,25	£24.279.05	£31,831,95	£31,149,85	£25,555,65			