

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN AND WEST NORFOLK

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 26 February 2015 at 6.30 pm in the
Committee Suite, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn**

The Mayor Councillor B Ayres

Councillors Miss L Bambridge, A Beales, R Bird, A Bubb,
Mrs J Collingham, A R Collins, D J Collis, J Collop, Mrs S Collop, C J Crofts,
N J Daubney, P Foster, I Gourlay, G Hipperson, M Chenery of Horsbrugh,
Lord Howard, M Howland, G Howman, H Humphrey, C Joyce, Mrs J Leamon,
B W C Long, J Loveless, A Lovett, G McGuinness, T C Manley, C Manning,
Mrs K Mellish, A Morrison, Mrs E A Nockolds, M Pitcher, D Pope, C Sampson,
Miss S Sandell, M S Storey, A Tyler, D Tyler, Mrs E Watson, D Whitby, A White,
Mrs M Wilkinson Mrs A Wright, T Wright and Mrs S Young.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Back, R P Beal, P Cousins,
R Groom, M Hopkins, M Langwade, A Lawrence, J Moriarty, M Peake, L Scott,
M Shorting, Mrs S Smeaton, Mrs V M Spikings, J M Tilbury, and G Wareham.

C81: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 29 January 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor with the amendment to C76, last sentence - .the inclusion of "on the advice of the Monitoring Officer that as the minutes were not presented to Council, Councillor Foster did not answer the question."

C82: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No interests were declared:

C83: **MAYOR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

There was none.

C84: **URGENT BUSINESS**

None

C85: **PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

The Mayor reported that there were 5 public questions being submitted to the meeting on the subject of the Major Housing Project. He invited each questioner to come forward and ask their questions. Councillor Beales, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Industrial Assets responded to each as set out below:

Joy Franklin:

"I have been watching the preparation for development on the Marsh Lane Site with interest, bearing in mind the planning application has not yet been submitted.

Ground clearance has taken place with the orchard and scrub land cleared, utility services have been put in place, extensive excavations have taken place, I attach recent photo's, a few boreholes have been drilled and fencing has now been erected round the entire site.

How much money, to date, has the Council spent, from our public purse, preparing the Marsh Lane Site for housing development?"

Councillor Beales responded that it was worth noting that Marsh Lane was rubbish strewn from one end to other before work started. Scrub clearance was only carried out after a Habitat Survey of December 2013 which followed earlier studies in 2008 and 2009. The clearance was conducted according to an ecological method statement and with an ecologist present; as she was aware the old orchard trees were left and would form a green open space. Planners and Environmental Health had been consulted at all stages and no work had been conducted that required planning permission. These works were a normal part of sound commercial practice.

All funding had been approved at meetings of the Cabinet and total spend to date on Marsh Lane amounted to £37,470.94.

As a supplementary question, Mrs Franklin asked the following:

In 1995 when 95 homes were applied for on the site and 2010 when 69 homes were applied for the applications failed due to the unsuitability of Marsh Lane for the volume of construction traffic. With the issue of predetermination of the planning applications, what will happen if the Lynnsport Access Road doesn't gain consent and the critical link isn't built prior to September when it is planned construction will begin.

Councillor Beales responded that the easiest way to develop the land would be to put it up for sale where developers would have found a way to do it without the new road, but we thought that wasn't suitable. With the Council run site it would be done with democratic oversight and wouldn't happen in private. He confirmed that the Environment Agency did have some concerns but they didn't make objections, but set out what needed to be done to mitigate their concerns. He felt that if the road application failed it was unlikely the development would go ahead.

Verity Connolly: (LARA Committee Member & Co Chair of West Norfolk Green Party)

"Are there any financial implications reliant on the timeframes for this project?"

Councillor Beales responded that in common with all such projects the timescale could have a major impact upon the financial outcome. The proposal had been due for consideration at Cabinet on 13th January 2015, but was delayed on his recommendation to the Cabinet meeting of 3rd February 2015. The reasons for this were detailed as follows: "To allow the Portfolio Holder and Officers to prepare responses to the consultation exercise, and to respond to concerns of some Members." A further important consideration was that the extra time allowed scrutiny by elected Councillors at Resources and Performance Panel and at Cabinet Scrutiny on 19 February 2015 (when many members of the public attended).

In terms of the financial and physical implications, a delay in obtaining planning permission for Marsh Lane could mean it was impracticable to start ground works (foundations, road bases etc.) with the onset of winter and could push the project into 2016 and so incur cost increases on the contracts. The costs incurred had been balanced by doing the job properly.

As a supplementary, Ms Connolly asked how, with the financial implications incurred, could the Council ensure that Councillors' votes were democratic and value for money is ensured before the consultation takes place.

Councillor Beales confirmed that there were aspects of the consultation that he would have done differently, but the level of public awareness showed that the ambition to raise the awareness had been achieved. He drew attention to the allegations that the Council wasn't listening but one of the major points of the project was removed after the consultation process. The money expended so far had been spent to protect the public purse to examine the site, assess flooding risk etc. With regard to the democratic consideration, Council would vote on whether it went forward to the planning stage, and if it was approved this evening it would go forward and comply with planning guidance, and Councillors would vote on the merits of the application submitted.

Elizabeth James: of 90 Wootton Road, Gaywood, on behalf of the King's Lynn Civic Society.

The welcome dropping of Lynnsport 2 from the scheme notwithstanding, the 22 acres total (8 ha approx.) quoted in the Cabinet Members report represents a significant loss of the open amenity space as mapped by the 2006 open space assessment, because the total area of Lynnsport 1-5 as existing, excluding Marsh Lane, is about 30

acres (12.29 ha). LDF C16.3 advises 2.4 ha open space per 1000 pop, so do you feel that this diminution from open space provision for about 5,000 people to provision for 3,000 is acceptable?

Councillor Beales responded that he was aware of “C.16.3 Fields in Trust (The National Playing Fields Association) recommendation a standard of 2.4 hectares of outdoor playing space per 1,000 population. It was a nationally recognised standard, which could be used to determine the level of play space in new developments.” He had read the Civic Society’s letter dated 14th February 2015 and had been through the 2006 report referred to therein. Given the conclusion of that report he agreed with the Civic Society view that “there may be a case for more development in and near the town if it is sustainable (close to existing facilities, potential to reduce car dependence, not using farmland etc.)”. It was that case he made and so the answer to the question was yes he did believe the proposal to be acceptable. However, it was important to note that he was merely recommending the proposal go forward to the planning stage and any planning application would have to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council’s own planning policies.

As a supplementary Mrs Jones asked, how her calculations for the catchment area for the nearest amenity squared with the figures in the assessment. She agreed to provide Councillor Beales with the figures she was referring to.

Councillor Beales responded that he considered the figures quoted in the document as acceptable. He was happy to receive the figures she referred to to give them consideration.

Stuart Hall:

Could the Council clarify what form of public consultation it is intending to offer the general public once the council adopts the new revised housing plans for Lynnsport and it enters the planning stages?

Councillor Beales responded that if the project was approved this evening and went to a planning application, a Public Engagement Forum for residents and other interested parties was going to be set up to feed into the Marsh Lane planning process before the planning application was submitted.

A further open event during public consultation phase of Marsh Lane planning application

A further public consultation planned on Lynnsport southern sites as they neared but prior to planning application stage.
The Public Engagement Forum would be asked its views on the proposal going forward.

As a supplementary, Mr Hall asked if the Council would consider making a Neighbourhood Forum in line with the Localism Act.

In response Councillor Beales confirmed he would be using the template which was used on the NORA site.

Mrs Sue Bruce:

There have been rumours that the land at Lynnsport was owned by the Seaman's family and passed to the Borough Council with the provision that it was to be used for recreation purposes only and not for housing. Can information be provided as to there being any covenant relating to the proposed developments for the areas known as Lynnsport 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 please?

Councillor Beales responded that there were no such covenants known on the land within this proposal. He set out when each of the phases was conveyed and from whom, and the fact that the only covenant was on the west Marsh Lane site from 1974 to permit the farmer (Seaman) to hold over the corn stores for the 1974 harvest.

As a supplementary, Mrs Bruce thanked the Council for removing the Lynnsport 2 site from the development, but drew attention to the fact that other residents didn't want their green spaces to be developed and wanted the green space to remain. She asked if there would be free votes to represent the views of the electorate on the decision and not group decisions.

Councillor Beales responded that he was not a leader of a Group but that Councillors would vote on the merit of the proposals as they saw it.

Councillor Joyce suggested that the Group Leaders may wish to answer the question.

Councillor Daubney responded that there was no whip on the Conservative Group. Councillor Collop for the Labour Group confirmed the same. Councillor Foster confirmed the UKIP Group did not have a whip policy, as did Councillor Loveless for the Lib Dem Group.

The Mayor thanked all the questioners for their questions.

C86 : **THE FINANCIAL PLAN 2014/2018 AND COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION 2015/2016**

Councillor Daubney presented his budget which was set out in Cabinet Minute CAB143 from the meeting on 3 February 2015. In presenting the budget Councillor Daubney drew attention to the fact that it proposed a 0% increase in Council Tax again for 2015/16. He highlighted the fact that in West Norfolk, the town centre was vibrant, the market places were newly refurbished, the bus station was being

remodelled and fit for purpose, there was smart attractive welcoming coastal resorts and beautiful surroundings and Downham Market was attracting business and business interest like never before. He considered that was because people could see the political will to improve things and financial competence.

Councillor Daubney drew attention to £7.6m of savings achieved since 2009 despite reductions in revenue support from the Government. He expressed the hope that the UKIP and Labour Groups would not abstain in the vote, and drew attention to the fact that the budget had not been scrutinised by the other groups.

He drew attention to the achievements of the Council in recent times such as the forming of the Leisure Trust, income generation for CCTV and parking control, using new technologies to deliver savings, Channel shift and new computer technology for Members which would deliver savings over 4 years.

He further drew attention to the delivery of improvements in villages, enhancements in towns, weekly food waste collection, superb leisure and sports facilities, Partnership working specifically on local education enhancement programme, business support initiatives and the Business Innovation Centre, support for the College Technology block and the continuance of the Apprentice Scheme.

He confirmed that there had been cuts in the cost of running the Council and in waste, but he considered nobody delivered better services to residents and support for businesses, at a cost of £2 per week per household, which included bins emptied streets, swept and the sports and arts support. He confirmed that car parking charges would also remain the same.

In summing up Councillor Daubney drew attention to the expertise and ability of the Council's Financial Officers and thanked the Chief Executive for that support. In particular he thanked the Deputy Chief Executive David Thomason for the valuable and supportive advice he had given over the years, he considered the Council owed a huge debt to him. He reminded Members that Lorraine Gore had stepped up to the mark magnificently in her role as S151 Chief Financial Officer.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Long who in doing so praised the Leader for the work he put in and the vision of the provision of services to the public as it was. He drew attention to the fact that there had only been 1 small increase to Council Tax in his time as Deputy. He considered that the Council had an enviable record amongst other organisations in the country which others were struggling to match. He reminded Members that people would see an increase in their bills due to the police or county, but not the Borough. He commented that in years to come things would not get any easier, but this Council was in good, sound financial shape.

Councillor J Collop, as Leader of the Labour Group, stated that he didn't recognise what was being said about a wonderful Council. The Council was aware of the amendments he had submitted to Council previously at budget time, but this year he was not intending to put an amendment on pest control, but if elected into power this year, a free of charge pest control service would be re-introduced.

Councillor Collop drew attention to the proposed levels of increase put into the budget for future years, and pointed out that a 1.5% increase was only 3p per week per household on a band D property. Without making those increases the compound interest was not there, which made it harder to raise income, and if something was not done problems would occur in the future, also bearing in mind that if Councils wanted to raise the level by over 2% a referendum was required. He also drew attention to the fact that the increase in special expenses would be met by the general tax payer. In considering the lack of increases in recent years, Councillor Collop also drew attention to the fact that a small percentage decrease in car parking income, particularly when the country's financial situation was volatile, could cost the Council dearly.

Councillor Collop countered the Leaders comments about keeping Council Tax down by referring to the grant received from Government to encourage Council's to do so. He commented on the fact that 1.5% would bring in £99,000, which was not sufficient to fund the town centre promotions, which was being continued despite needing the finances for something such as pest control.

Councillor Collop drew attention to the fact that the budget book showed increases in the budget for Councillors' Allowances, ICT and pension support, and that in 2017/18 spending level was £2m above income. He considered the Council was at tipping point as his group had issues with the levels of some services provided because of the draw on the service. He considered that the new Council, post elections, would have to give consideration to the way forward.

Councillor Gourlay, in referring to the budget and the achievements of the Council drew attention to the removal of the rented housing from the proposed Major Housing Scheme on the agenda. He considered the Leisure Trust to be a VAT avoidance scheme with non democratically elected people in control of it. He considered that there was a need for pest control across the Borough, there were 2000 empty properties across the Borough not being pursued and brought back into use, untidy land often in breach of planning permissions. Pollution in King's Lynn had increased, but the car parking charges were being frozen, when he considered the issue of parking permits for those people living on main bus routes should be looked at which would solve the crisis in parking and traffic jams in the town. He felt

that schools and colleges should also do the same for their students in relation to them being driven to school.

Councillor Gourlay also drew attention to the loss of the community development teams which he considered were once cornerstones of the Council's achievements. In summing up he stated he would not be voting in support of the budget, and looked forward to a new Administration.

Councillor Howman asked if the Leader was proud of the increased demands on food banks. The Leader responded that the prevention of such things was why it was important to keep Council tax down.

Councillor Joyce queried the reports in the press relating to the reported increase in Members allowances, to which the Leader had quoted that it was because of the IT project which would save £15,000 pa. He questioned how that element of the budget was made up because £160,000 of the budget was not relating to the specific elements discussed.

Councillor Mrs Wilkinson asked why the clean up teams had been diverted to special projects, by how many the staffing numbers had dropped and who owned each parcel of land – Freebridge, the Borough Council or County Council etc.

Councillor Tyler in referring to the achievements listed by the Leader commented that a modest increase in tax wouldn't have been such a problem for the residents of the Borough, and the Leader would have been able to list further achievements.

Councillor McGuinness commented on the Leader's assertion each year that a vote against his budget was a vote for increasing Council Tax. He wished it to be made clear that he disagreed with the Plan in general. He drew attention to the claims of efficiencies and innovation but said nothing of the grant from central government to keep increases to a minimum. He also questioned the budget on Members allowances and ICT, and stated he had no confidence in the Plan so would not be voting for it.

Councillor Foster, in referring to the £7m of savings achieved asked if the Council had wasted £42m of taxpayers money before that time.

Councillor Daubney responded that as soon as his Administration took over they immediately started to make savings. He made reference to the costs incurred by previous Administrations and the lack of care for heritage buildings or the town centre which was closing down. He reminded Members that the Independent Panel which made recommendations on Members expenses had always recommended higher increases than that which had been proposed by the Administration, but in recent years there were no proposed increases

on Members expenses. The budget line referred to related to a re-allocation of costs across different headings and increased member training following the election.

With regard to the pest control service, Councillor Daubney reminded Members that people could still engage people to help with any issues they had in that vein. He also commented that the suggestion that the Borough was paying for the parking permits for Freebridge and others was wrong. He reassured Members that should his Administration not be successful in the next elections, any new Administration could be reassured that the finances were in good order. He was proud to set a standard in spending money wisely for the good of the community, having set specific targets each year and met those targets with balanced budgets looking to the future for the community and its young people so they could get well paid employment and good schooling. He moved the Financial Plan.

As required under SI2014, No 165 Local Government England, the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) regs, a recorded vote was taken on the budget and Council tax setting decision as follows:

For the substantive Motion	Against the Substantive Motion	Abstain
B Ayres	A Collins	R Bird
L Bambridge	D J Collis	
A Beales	J Collop	
A Bubb	S Collop	
M Chenery of Horsbrugh	P Foster	
J Collingham	I Gourlay	
C Crofts	G Howman	
N Daubney	C Joyce	
G Hipperson	J Leamon	
G Howard	G McGuinness	
M Howland	M Pitcher	
H Humphrey	A Tyler	
B Long	M Wilkinson	
J Loveless		
A Lovett		
T Manley		
C Manning		
K Mellish		
A Morrison		
E Nockolds		
D Pope		
C Sampson		
S Sandell		
M Storey		
D Tyler		

E Watson		
D Whitby		
A White		
A Wright		
T Wright		
S Young		
31	13	1

The proposal was agreed.

RESOLVED: That pursuant to Minute CAB143: The Budget 2014/2018, of the Cabinet Meeting held on 3 February 2015 the following be approved:

- 1) **Approve the revision to the Budget for 2014/2015** (as set out in Appendix 4 of the report).
- 2) **Reaffirm the Policy on Earmarked Reserves and General Fund Working Balance and the maximum balances set for the reserves.**
- 3) **Approve the budget of £18,070,690 for 2015/2016 and note the projections for 2016/2017 and 2017/2018** (as set out in Appendix 4 of the report).
- 4) **Approve the level of Special Expenses for Town/ Parish Councils** (as set out in the Appendix to these minutes).
- 5) **Approve the Fees and Charges for 2015/2016** as detailed in Appendix 4 of "The Financial Plan 2014/2018" booklet as reported to Cabinet on 3 February 2015.
- 6) **Approve a minimum requirement of the General Fund balance for 2015/2016 of £937,781.**
- 7) **The Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012 contain rules for the calculation of the Council Tax Base, which is an amount required by the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to be used in the calculation of the tax by the Council as the billing authority, and Norfolk County Council and the Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner as major precepting authorities, and in the calculation of the precept payable by the Council to the County Council and Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner.**

Under Officer Delegated Decision the Council Tax Base was calculated as follows for the year 2015/2016:

Number of dwellings in each Council Tax band; taking into account the multipliers, discounts, exemptions, rate of collection and Council Tax Support.

(a) 47,284 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, as its Council Tax Base for the year.

The tax base for each Parish

(b) the amounts listed on pages 9-12 of the report, (Column headed - Taxbase) being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, as the amount of its Council Taxbase for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

8) Approve that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2015/2016 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

Total expenditure

(a) £96,454,060 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) (a) to (f) of the Act. (See Appendix 5 of the report).

Total income

(b) £88,783,470 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) (a) to (d) of the Act. (See Appendix 5 of the report).

The difference between expenditure and income

(c) £7,670,590 being the amount by which the aggregate at 8(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 8(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its total budget for the year. (See Appendix 5 of the report).

Average Council Tax for Band D property (Borough and Parish)

(d) £162.22 being the amount at 8(c) above divided by the amount at 7(a) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with

Section 31B(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.

The total of Parish Precepts and Special Expenses

(e) £2,376,200 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.

The Borough Council's Council Tax for a Band D property (excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses)

(f)(1) £111.97 being the amount at 8(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 8(e) above by the amount at 7(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.

The Borough Council's Council Tax for each valuation band

(f)(2)							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£ 74.65	£ 87.09	£ 99.53	£ 111.97	£ 136.85	£ 161.73	£ 186.62	£223.94

The Borough and Parish Councils' Council Tax for a Band D property in each Parish (pages 13-16 of the report)

(g) the amounts listed in Col (4), pages 9-12 of the report, when added to the amount at 8(f)(1) above being the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned divided in each case by the taxbases on pages 9-12 of the report, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, gives the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwelling in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

The Borough and Parish Councils' Council Tax for each tax band in each Parish (pages 13-16 of the report)

(h) the amounts listed in Cols (1) to (8), pages 9-12 of the report, together with the amounts shown above in 8(f)(2) as valuation bands A to H - being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 8(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation

band, divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

9) Note that for the year 2015/2016 Norfolk County Council and the Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Valuation Band	Norfolk County Council £	Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner £	Charge in Relation to Band D
A	763.38	139.20	6/9ths
B	890.61	162.40	7/9ths
C	1,017.84	185.60	8/9ths
D	1,145.07	208.80	9/9ths
E	1,399.53	255.20	11/9ths
F	1,653.99	301.60	13/9ths
G	1,908.45	348.00	15/9ths
H	2,290.14	417.60	18/9ths

<p>The total Council Tax for each band in each parish (pages 17-20 of the report)</p>

10) Approve that, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 8(h) and 9) above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets these as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2015/2016 for each of the categories of dwellings shown.

11) Approve that the Chief Financial Officer, Revenues and Benefits Manager, Revenues Manager, Team Leaders, Committal Manager, Committal Officer, Revenues Officers and Revenues Assistants be authorised to demand and recover, in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the Council Tax set by this resolution and be authorised to appear on behalf of the Council in Magistrates' Courts in respect of recovery proceedings.

12) Approve that the Officers be authorised to give notice of the setting of the Council Tax in accordance with Section 96 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

C87: **CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS**

In accordance with Standing Order 11.1 reports were submitted from Cabinet Members, upon which they answered questions from Members of the Council.

i) Councillor Mrs E Nockolds – Culture, Tourism and Marketing

Councillor Mrs Nockolds presented her report. Councillor J Collop asked what Alive Leisure fees and charges were to be for the coming year compared with other services. Councillor Mrs Nockolds reminded Members that a representative of the Trust attended the Regeneration Environment and Community Panel (REC) twice a year to inform the Council about the detailed arrangements for the Trust. She explained that the fees and charges were reviewed at the last meeting, but as the Trust had only been in operation since September there were not full year figures on usage, the Trust decided to leave the fees and charges as they currently are and review them between now and next year.

Councillor Collop commented that he felt there weren't many questions being asked of the Trust at the REC meeting and not much information coming through, when he felt Members needed to know. He also commented that he thought the Trust would try to keep the prices down. Councillor Mrs Nockolds explained that as it had only been in operation since September, the Trust had a number of important documents to review, so the fees and charges would receive a complete review in due course, but were still encouraging more people to take part in sport.

Councillor Chenery of Horsbrugh asked for more detail on the 900th anniversary of the Magna Carta celebrations, and what would happen to the artefacts being sent to the Records Office.

Councillor Mrs Nockolds explained that as part of the £1.8m Heritage Lottery grant for the Town Hall the archives storage and regalia displays etc were being restored and their contents were being packed and sent to Norwich. The King John Cup, Sword and facsimile of the Magna Carta were being kept in King's Lynn until after the weekend of the 13/14 June when there was a celebration event to mark the 900th anniversary which would be arranged working with the Norfolk Records and Museums services.

Councillor A Tyler asked if there were any other events planned of interest. Councillor Mrs Nockolds informed Members that there were a number of event planned throughout the year to try to encourage a vibrant town centre to help businesses in the town. Some of the things were the Festivals, a Hanse conference and Festival, Heritage Weekend, 1940s Weekend and the Air Training Corps parading

through the town. The Corps were seeking sponsors for spitfire models throughout the town on a trail.

Councillor Howman asked if the Portfolio Holder would comment on the proposed loss of amenity land at Russet Close, Reffley, and whether she had lodged an objection to the planning application. Councillor Mrs Nockolds commented that she thought it was a special piece of land, which she had drawn attention to when she had portfolio responsibility for such open spaces. She had not lodged an objection.

Councillor Joyce asked if the Cabinet Member had registered her objection to the development with other Cabinet Members. Councillor Mrs Nockolds confirmed she had not, and was no longer the Cabinet Member for that area.

Councillor Pitcher asked if any of the documents which were being transferred to Norwich would be made available on line. Councillor Mrs Nockolds explained that they would be there on a temporary basis until the archives at the Town Hall had been restored and improved. Whilst in Norwich, some would be digitised so able to view on line.

Councillor Mrs Leamon in commenting on the meeting with Dr Mack of the CCG asked whether the Council's responsibilities for care in the community would be escalated. Councillor Mrs Nockolds explained that her meeting with Dr Mack to ensure she was aware of a number of issues before attending the Health and Wellbeing Board meeting at the County Council.

ii) **Councillor Mrs V Spikings - Development**

Councillor Mrs Spikings was not present at the meeting, Members were invited to put their question on email.

iii) **Councillor A Lawrence – Housing and Community**

Councillor Lawrence was not present at the meeting, Members were invited to put their question on email.

Councillor Gourlay asked how many of the 2000 empty properties in the Borough the Council had been instrumental in bringing back to use.

iv) **Councillor D Pope – ICT Leisure and Public Space**

Councillor Pope presented his report. Councillor Joyce asked Councillor Pope if he objected to the planning application for Russett Close, Reffley. Councillor Pope explained he was not aware of the site.

Councillor Humphrey commended Councillor Pope on the progress with the Kettlewell Lane improvement works which were being carried

out including considerable community involvement in the scheme. He also asked about the Green Flag status. Councillor Pope responded that he considered the green space to be a premium in the area, that the site would be safer with more lighting, clearing rubbish and scrub and making it a wildlife haven alongside the river bank creating a green space in the town centre which in twelve months he hoped would be beautiful. He also informed Members that the Borough currently had 4 green flags but was trying for 6. Councillor Pope also commended the gardens at the Crematorium which were a picture.

Councillor Mrs Collingham expressed interest in hearing the information about the Crematorium gardens which she had heard very positive comments about. Councillor Pope also referred to positive comments received about the service delivered by the staff there at such sad and difficult times for people.

Councillor A Tyler commented that he was pleased with the activities at Kettlewell Lane and asked if residents would be encouraged to form "Friends of" Groups. He also complimented the Councillor on the service at the bus station to assist passengers in finding the correct buses, and asked if it would be a permanent service. Councillor Pope responded that he didn't think the group had been formed yet as they were working in partnership with the Gaywood Valley Rivers Trust. With regard to the staffing at the bus station it was proposed to continue the service.

Councillor Leamon asked what the cost of the bus supervisor was and if the bus operators contributed to it. It was confirmed that the bus operators contributed at least half.

Councillor Foster asked if Councillor Pope would be voting against the loss of green space in the recommendation later on the agenda. Councillor Pope responded that he would not, but he was doing his best to improve the green spaces, with the Kettlewell Lane site being used by many more people.

Councillor Loveless expressed delight in the work being done at Kettlewell Lane, which he was participating in as a member of the community, turning a jungle into an area which can be used. The site was ready for wild flower seed. He commended the formation of "friends of" groups for such spaces, and suggested that one could be formed for some of the areas on Lynnsport to bring them into better use. With the potential for another Green Flag with a lot of work and support. Councillor Pope responded that he was in favour of something which would make an area better.

Councillor Bambridge explained that she was also involved with the Kettlewell Lane work which had fantastic input from local people, the Norfolk Wildlife Trust and the Council's Grounds Maintenance team.

The Friends would be meeting on 23 March, where the Trust may have some additional funding.

v) **Councillor A Beales – Regeneration and Industrial Assets**

Councillor Beales presented his report. Councillor Mrs Collop asked why the electronic bus timetable wasn't working at the bus station, and if passengers would have to wait until the refurbishment was finished before it was working. Councillor Beales confirmed the real time bus and train information would not be available until towards the end of the project due to the logistics of the works required.

Councillor Pitcher referred to Planning Committee documentation which referred to national policy resisting the loss of open space. He asked if there was evidence to support any view that the Lynnsport site was surplus to requirements. Councillor Beales responded that he had demonstrated his views, mitigating concerns, unlike some other comments which had been made.

Councillor J Collop thanked Councillor Beales for showing himself and Mrs Collop the Lynnsport site to enable them to familiarise themselves with the proposals. Councillor Beales acknowledged that such visits worked both ways, he had also met with the public, MP and others on site and was grateful for the knowledge imparted.

Councillor Foster made reference to a Cabinet meeting of 6 March 2012 on the Queen Elizabeth Fields Trust where he had asked who would protect those fields owned by the Borough Council. He referred to the response received that the longer term needs for the area had to be considered.

Councillor Beales explained that he was going to bring an amendment later in the meeting with regards to protection of the Lynnsport 2 site.

Councillor Foster commented that Councillor Beales had declined to answer the question at Cabinet Scrutiny Committee on the issue of the access to the junction with Edward Benefer Way. Councillor Beales responded that he had not declined to answer any questions on the matter, but was conscious that the expert witness had been invited to the meeting specifically for highways issues and it was he who had not answered the question. He stated that the access road was on balance of overall benefit, information which had come from the County Highways senior officer.

vi) **Councillor Lord Howard – Special Projects**

Councillor Lord Howard presented his report. Councillor Loveless complimented the recently installed steel engraved outline at the Charnel Chapel. He asked if the outline would be extended further to where the Chapel would have reached. He also enquired when the

interpretation board would be installed, and the cycle stands would be erected. Councillor Lord Howard commented that there would be an interpretation board installed and said that he would take advice on the other matters.

vii) **Councillor B Long – Environment and Deputy Leader**

Councillor Long presented his report. Councillor Gourlay asked what the situation was with Material Works as he believed the three months notice period was up. Councillor Long responded that the notice was due after 13 March. At that point there would be a discussion and a delegated decision taken on the future of the contract.

Councillor Joyce asked if and when the trolley collection service would be returning to King's Lynn as trolleys were re-appearing in ditches etc since it had stopped. Councillor Long responded that the service had been a commercial operation which had been overtaken by the shops operating their own collection service and they had to demonstrate that they would keep up with the clearing of the trolleys. Councillor Loveless made reference to the large number of trolleys he had counted in the Bawsey drain, which he was concerned about along with the additional incidences of fly tipping in the area which usually followed the dumping of trolleys. Councillor Long confirmed the clean up would be kept under review.

Councillor McGuinness asked if it was usual for staff carrying out statutory responsibilities to be moved to corporate project work as he had been waiting for street name plates to be replaced and was facing long delays because they were working on other things. Councillor Long explained that the team were working on a Seagate project, and had to be involved in a number of different things, they could not wait for a request to come in for a replacement of street sign.

viii) **Councillor N J Daubney – Leader**

Councillor Daubney presented his report. Councillor McGuinness made reference to the Planning Inspector's decision which dismissed the appeal on the Anglian Water Sludge Transfer Station at West Lynn, he asked if when the authority was a statutory consultee to an application the Ward Members should also be consulted. Councillor Daubney confirmed that Ward Members ought to be consulted.

Councillor J Collop asked if there was any news on what the Government Funding would be for future years. Councillor Daubney confirmed that there had been some assistance to date to help keep Council Tax down, he congratulated officers for accurately estimating what those levels would be. No information had been received for the period after 2015/16 yet, but he cautioned that the Council had to keep its own financial situation in order, and a longer term projection helped with that.

Councillor Mrs Wright asked the Leader to elaborate on the importance of the Borough being part of the Hanse Business network. Councillor Daubney explained that King's Lynn had been part of the Hanse League for 10 years, which had led to a great deal of exchange, leading to huge business opportunities for businesses in West Norfolk who either did trade or wanted to trade in Europe. The Hanse Conference which King's Lynn were hosting would co-incide with the Hanse Festival and would bring top speakers and advisors to the town. The information on the conference was available on the website, and he expressed the hope that the many local businesses who had expressed an interest would participate constructively.

Councillor Mrs Mellish asked for some detail on the cost benefits of the proposed change in Councillor IT. Councillor Daubney drew attention to the proposed savings to be made over a 4 year period, along with the improved portable service which members would have by using the new technology and the Mod Gov system. By moving to the new systems savings would be made in staff time by not having to visit Members' homes to install equipment.

Councillor Collis asked if the Leader was still playing an active part in the Partnership in West Norfolk. He drew attention to the performance figures on education for the Borough which had improved over 2 years, but was not as good in the last year and asked what measures were being put in place to put it back on the track which it was on. Councillor Daubney, in drawing attention to the fact that education wasn't a District function, but all had a responsibility for it for the good of the community. Things were not good for West Norfolk so he felt the Council needed to get involved with various initiatives introduced for best practice which had a dramatic effect initially which was not being seen now. Work was still needed to tackle the targets now. Councillor Collis concurred that something had to be done, he was grateful that the matter was being taken seriously and looked forward to working with the Council in his role at the County Council to get improvements for the future years.

Councillor Morrison asked how the Council's Council Tax levels compared with other authorities. Councillor Daubney commented that he believed in providing as much as possible for as little as possible. Since 2005 the average Council Tax had risen by 17%, whereas the Boroughs had only risen by 3% and it was one of the top three performing Councils in the UK.

Councillor A Tyler asked if with the new Councillor IT facilities there would still be the facility for Councillors to obtain hard copies if necessary. Councillor Daubney responded that in practice, as Councillors got used to using the new equipment and received training they would be surprised how quickly they didn't need paper copies,

but there would be the support in paper terms but Councillors wouldn't get printing facilities but advice and help would be given.

Councillor McGuinness made reference to the report in the paper on the level of savings to be achieved by how much the budgets had risen by. Councillor Daubney made reference to the detail given in the Resources and Performance Panel where the breakdown of the budget was explained. He undertook to send round the explanation of the breakdown to Councillors.

Councillor Howman asked what view the Leader had of the growing demand for the food bank in King's Lynn and what was the Council doing to assist. Councillor Daubney responded that there was not a budget for Food Banks, but the Council had a requirement to set a budget so they wouldn't be needed.

Councillor J Collop asked the Leader not to make references to meetings which some Members had not been able to attend as it was not always possible to attend. Councillor Daubney commented that the meetings had been full of vital information which Members had been asking many questions about this evening.

Councillor Gourlay asked if the proposed members IT equipment would be insured and secure. Councillor Daubney confirmed the equipment would be insured and complied with all security requirements.

Councillor Mrs Wilkinson asked if she would get answers to the questions she asked earlier in the meeting, Councillor Daubney reminded Members that the questions were asked during a debate, not question and answers. Councillor Mrs Wilkinson asked for an answer to the number of staff that the Council had decreased. Councillor Daubney explained that the process of 1 for 1 loss and gains for staff numbers had been maintained in order to hold down costs. He agreed to provide the information in writing.

C88: **MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME**

Councillor Long asked Councillor Joyce as Chairman of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee if the invitation to the Leader of the County UKIP Group to the meeting had proved useful.

The Monitoring Officer advised that as no minutes were being presented to the meeting for approval so no questions should be asked. She explained that it had been custom and practice to permit questions under this item for any Chairmen, but since Councillor Foster had raised the issue she had no choice but to remind Members of what the Standing Order wording was. It was proposed to amend that item in Standing Orders to permit questions at the next review. Councillor

Joyce commented that he would be happy to respond to any questions.

Councillor McGuinness asked the Mayor if he was content that the meeting of Council in November could be held in King's Court. The Mayor responded that he was satisfied that in the light of the power cut to the area, for the health and safety of the Council the meeting should be moved.

The Monitoring Officer explained that under standing orders where it was required to vacate the building due to the risk to Members and the public, a decision was taken by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Mayor and Leader of the Council to re-locate. All Members of the public were re-directed and notices displayed on site. She agreed to provide Councillor McGuinness with the relevant Standing Order.

C89: **CABINET: 3 FEBRUARY 2015**

It was proposed by Councillor Daubney, and seconded by Councillor Long that the recommendations from the meeting on 3 February 2015 be approved.

CAB144: Capital Programme and Resources 2014-18 was approved without debate.

CAB145: Major Housing Development – Final Approval (NB: there are no Council recommendations within this item but the recommendations in CAB147 below arise from the 2 reports)
(Exempt report) CAB147: Major Housing Development – Final Approval

In debating CAB145 and 147, Councillor Beales proposed and Councillor Lord Howard seconded, the following amendment to the recommendations in the form of an additional recommendation 7:

“7 That the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration seeks advice on how best to ensure that the area known as Lynnsport 2 and the adjacent (proposed) nature area remains green open space and free from future development. That a suitable recommendation is brought before Council for consideration as soon as possible”.

The amendment was agreed and so formed part of the substantive Motion.

Councillor Gourlay commented that he had initially been seduced by the idea of more houses in the local economy, more rented homes and apprenticeships, but in the time he had not been well, the recommendations had changed, the rented homes had been removed, any plans for moving the swimming pool onto the site in the future was gone. He asked why the proposal was being pushed ahead when the

NORA site was not yet finished, and the NCP site in town was still in the same condition as it had been for years and would be a good development site for houses. He felt there were different rules for different sites, as Fairstead was protective of its open spaces, and he felt hypocritical to vote on those in villages, and push this recommendation through. He considered that there was a lot of work to go at to bring homes back into use, such as flats over shops, empty homes. He considered that it was being pushed forward for the money, and asked if it would be spent on a Marina.

Councillor McGuinness drew attention to the debate held at Cabinet Scrutiny where the need for further public consultation was made. He also commented that as Councillor Beales had indicated that a major risk in delaying would be the increase in costs, and asked if as the country was close to deflation, was it the right thing to be doing.

Councillor J Collop referred to his support for further consultation, as a number of people had not been happy with the consultation which had taken place. He proposed a further amendment to the recommendations as follows:

“8) That another session of consultation over a weekend be agreed.”

Councillor Joyce expressed concerns about several aspects of the scheme, some of which would be ironed out at the planning stage. The Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Board would be consultees and the planners would take notice of their comments. He could not see the rush, particularly as grass could be laid at a different time. He drew attention to the fact that the tarmac could be laid and building constructed in winter. He felt that further consultation should be entered into. He drew attention to comments made that the NORA consultative group did not deliver what some people had wanted.

At this point, Councillor Beales proposed and it was seconded by Councillor Daubney that Council should continue to sit at 9.30pm. This was agreed.

Councillor Howman referred to the Community calling for further consultation.

Councillor Foster spoke in support of the amendment, in that further consultation would be useful. He considered that if more information was available Councillor Beales may have changed his mind as green space was at a premium.

Councillor Beales responded that it was not turf which was a problem to lay in the winter, but astroturf. He commented that the irony was that the public was present because of the 3 rounds of public consultation which had been held. There were some issues raised, but there would

be full clarity at the planning application stage. The public engagement forum would be set up before the planning application was submitted, and there would be the statutory public comment period on the planning application. Due to the palpable levels of consultation already undertaken, and in the future he urged Members not to support the amendment.

Councillor Daubney commented that it was necessary to develop the detail for people to be able to see so there would be full engagement in the planning application process.

Councillor J Collop, with the required number of supporters proposed a recorded vote on the amendment.

For the Amendment	Against the Amendment	Abstain
A Collins	B Ayres	
D J Collis	L Bambridge	
J Collop	A Beales	
S Collop	A Bubb	
P Foster	M Chenery of Horsbrugh	
I Gourlay	C Crofts	
G Howman	N Daubney	
C Joyce	G Hipperson	
J Leamon	G Howard	
J Loveless	M Howland	
G McGuinness	H Humphrey	
M Pitcher	B Long	
A Tyler	T Manley	
M Wilkinson	C Manning	
	K Mellish	
	A Morrison	
	E Nockolds	
	D Pope	
	C Sampson	
	S Sandell	
	M Storey	
	D Tyler	
	E Watson	
	D Whitby	
	A White	
	A Wright	
	T Wright	
	S Young	
14	28	0

The amendment was lost.

Councillor McGuinness asked if it was proper for the Mayor to have a vote in the proceedings, to which the Mayor confirmed it was

appropriate. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that it was entirely appropriate, and if the vote had been tied the Mayor would have the casting vote.

The Labour Group asked for a recorded vote on the substantive motion as follows:

For the Substantive Motion	Against the substantive Motion	Abstain
B Ayres	A Collins	
L Bambridge	D J Collis	
A Beales	J Collop	
A Bubb	S Collop	
M Chenery of Horsbrugh	P Foster	
C Crofts	I Gourlay	
N Daubney	G Howman	
G Hipperson	C Joyce	
G Howard	J Leamon	
M Howland	G McGuinness	
H Humphrey	M Pitcher	
B Long	A Tyler	
J Loveless	M Wilkinson	
T Manley		
C Manning		
K Mellish		
A Morrison		
E Nockolds		
D Pope		
C Sampson		
S Sandell		
M Storey		
D Tyler		
E Watson		
D Whitby		
A White		
A Wright		
T Wright		
S Young		
29	13	0

On being put to the vote the recommendation was approved.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations from the Cabinet meeting held on 3 February 2015, as amended be adopted

C90: **CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE : 19 FEBRUARY 2015**

There were no recommendations from the above Committee.

The Meeting closed at 9.40 pm

COUNCIL TAX 2015/2016
(Local Government Finance Act 1992 Section 30(2))

Parish	Valuation Bands			
	A (1)	B (2)	C (3)	D (4)
	£p	£p	£p	£p
Anmer	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Bagthorpe with Barmer	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Barton Bendish	1,012.30	1,181.02	1,349.73	1,518.45
Barwick	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Bawsey	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Bircham	1,005.04	1,172.55	1,340.05	1,507.56
Boughton	986.82	1,151.29	1,315.76	1,480.23
Brancaster	988.11	1,152.79	1,317.48	1,482.16
Burnham Market	1,005.82	1,173.46	1,341.09	1,508.73
Burnham Norton	986.63	1,151.07	1,315.50	1,479.94
Burnham Overy	991.67	1,156.95	1,322.22	1,487.50
Burnham Thorpe	1,014.32	1,183.38	1,352.43	1,521.48
Castle Acre	997.49	1,163.74	1,329.98	1,496.23
Castle Rising	980.10	1,143.44	1,306.79	1,470.14
Choseley	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Clenchwarton	1,011.66	1,180.26	1,348.87	1,517.48
Congham	1,007.32	1,175.21	1,343.09	1,510.98
Crimplesham	1,032.76	1,204.88	1,377.01	1,549.13
Denver	1,007.69	1,175.64	1,343.58	1,511.53
Dersingham	1,009.97	1,178.30	1,346.62	1,514.95
Docking	994.30	1,160.02	1,325.73	1,491.45
Downham Market	1,044.02	1,218.02	1,392.02	1,566.02
Downham West	1,015.92	1,185.24	1,354.56	1,523.88
East Rudham	1,015.12	1,184.31	1,353.49	1,522.68
East Walton	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
East Winch	1,003.09	1,170.27	1,337.45	1,504.63
Emneth	999.13	1,165.65	1,332.17	1,498.69
Feltwell	1,005.15	1,172.67	1,340.20	1,507.72
Fincham	1,003.40	1,170.64	1,337.87	1,505.10
Flitcham	996.38	1,162.45	1,328.51	1,494.57
Fordham	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Fring	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Gayton	1,001.13	1,167.98	1,334.84	1,501.69
Great Massingham	1,001.47	1,168.38	1,335.29	1,502.20
Grimston	996.58	1,162.68	1,328.77	1,494.87
Harpley	995.18	1,161.04	1,326.90	1,492.76
Heacham	1,011.08	1,179.59	1,348.10	1,516.61
Hilgay	1,024.23	1,194.93	1,365.64	1,536.34
Hillington	996.46	1,162.54	1,328.61	1,494.69
Hockwold	1,005.66	1,173.26	1,340.87	1,508.48
Holme-next-Sea	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Houghton	989.17	1,154.03	1,318.89	1,483.75
Hunstanton	1,042.41	1,216.14	1,389.88	1,563.61
Ingoldisthorpe	1,004.16	1,171.51	1,338.87	1,506.23
King's Lynn	1,004.86	1,172.34	1,339.81	1,507.29
Leziate	1,005.57	1,173.16	1,340.76	1,508.35
Little Massingham	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Marham	1,011.12	1,179.63	1,348.15	1,516.67
Marshland St James	1,013.72	1,182.67	1,351.62	1,520.57
Methwold	1,032.48	1,204.55	1,376.63	1,548.71
Middleton	1,001.25	1,168.12	1,335.00	1,501.87

COUNCIL TAX 2015/2016
(Local Government Finance Act 1992 Section 30(2))

Parish	Valuation Bands			
	E (5)	F (6)	G (7)	H (8)
	£p	£p	£p	£p
Anmer	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Bagthorpe with Barmer	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Barton Bendish	1,855.88	2,193.31	2,530.75	3,036.90
Barwick	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Bawsey	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Bircham	1,842.57	2,177.58	2,512.60	3,015.12
Boughton	1,809.17	2,138.11	2,467.05	2,960.46
Brancaster	1,811.53	2,140.89	2,470.27	2,964.32
Burnham Market	1,844.00	2,179.27	2,514.55	3,017.46
Burnham Norton	1,808.81	2,137.69	2,466.57	2,959.88
Burnham Overy	1,818.05	2,148.61	2,479.17	2,975.00
Burnham Thorpe	1,859.58	2,197.69	2,535.80	3,042.96
Castle Acre	1,828.72	2,161.22	2,493.72	2,992.46
Castle Rising	1,796.84	2,123.53	2,450.24	2,940.28
Choseley	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Clenchwarton	1,854.70	2,191.91	2,529.14	3,034.96
Congham	1,846.75	2,182.52	2,518.30	3,021.96
Crimplesham	1,893.38	2,237.63	2,581.89	3,098.26
Denver	1,847.42	2,183.32	2,519.22	3,023.06
Dersingham	1,851.60	2,188.26	2,524.92	3,029.90
Docking	1,822.88	2,154.31	2,485.75	2,982.90
Downham Market	1,914.02	2,262.02	2,610.04	3,132.04
Downham West	1,862.52	2,201.16	2,539.80	3,047.76
East Rudham	1,861.05	2,199.42	2,537.80	3,045.36
East Walton	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
East Winch	1,838.99	2,173.35	2,507.72	3,009.26
Emneth	1,831.73	2,164.77	2,497.82	2,997.38
Feltwell	1,842.77	2,177.81	2,512.87	3,015.44
Fincham	1,839.56	2,174.03	2,508.50	3,010.20
Flitcham	1,826.69	2,158.82	2,490.95	2,989.14
Fordham	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Fring	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Gayton	1,835.40	2,169.10	2,502.82	3,003.38
Great Massingham	1,836.02	2,169.84	2,503.67	3,004.40
Grimston	1,827.06	2,159.25	2,491.45	2,989.74
Harpley	1,824.48	2,156.20	2,487.94	2,985.52
Heacham	1,853.63	2,190.65	2,527.69	3,033.22
Hilgay	1,877.75	2,219.15	2,560.57	3,072.68
Hillington	1,826.84	2,158.99	2,491.15	2,989.38
Hockwold	1,843.70	2,178.91	2,514.14	3,016.96
Holme-next-Sea	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Houghton	1,813.47	2,143.19	2,472.92	2,967.50
Hunstanton	1,911.08	2,258.54	2,606.02	3,127.22
Ingoldisthorpe	1,840.95	2,175.66	2,510.39	3,012.46
King's Lynn	1,842.24	2,177.19	2,512.15	3,014.58
Leziate	1,843.54	2,178.72	2,513.92	3,016.70
Little Massingham	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Marham	1,853.71	2,190.74	2,527.79	3,033.34
Marshland St James	1,858.47	2,196.37	2,534.29	3,041.14
Methwold	1,892.87	2,237.02	2,581.19	3,097.42
Middleton	1,835.62	2,169.36	2,503.12	3,003.74

COUNCIL TAX 2015/2016
(Local Government Finance Act 1992 Section 30(2))

Parish	Valuation Bands			
	A (1)	B (2)	C (3)	D (4)
	£p	£p	£p	£p
Nordelph	1,010.00	1,178.34	1,346.67	1,515.00
North Creake	1,023.71	1,194.33	1,364.94	1,535.56
North Runcton	1,000.91	1,167.73	1,334.54	1,501.36
Northwold	1,010.87	1,179.35	1,347.82	1,516.30
North Wootton	1,003.74	1,171.03	1,338.32	1,505.61
Old Hunstanton	999.09	1,165.60	1,332.12	1,498.63
Outwell	991.48	1,156.72	1,321.97	1,487.21
Pentney	1,021.63	1,191.90	1,362.17	1,532.44
Ringstead	1,010.38	1,178.77	1,347.17	1,515.56
Roydon	1,003.66	1,170.93	1,338.21	1,505.48
Runcton Holme	1,007.81	1,175.78	1,343.74	1,511.71
Ryston	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Sandringham	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Sedgeford	997.76	1,164.06	1,330.35	1,496.64
Sherborne	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Shouldham	1,010.19	1,178.55	1,346.92	1,515.28
Shouldham Thorpe	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Snettisham	1,030.89	1,202.70	1,374.52	1,546.33
South Creake	1,007.52	1,175.43	1,343.35	1,511.27
Southery	1,016.08	1,185.42	1,354.77	1,524.11
South Wootton	1,016.18	1,185.54	1,354.90	1,524.26
Stanhoe	1,011.68	1,180.29	1,348.90	1,517.51
Stoke Ferry	1,006.94	1,174.76	1,342.58	1,510.40
Stow Bardolph	1,000.09	1,166.77	1,333.45	1,500.13
Stradsett	977.23	1,140.10	1,302.97	1,465.84
Syderstone	1,006.34	1,174.06	1,341.78	1,509.50
Terrington St Clement	1,031.46	1,203.36	1,375.27	1,547.18
Terrington St John	1,005.11	1,172.63	1,340.14	1,507.66
Thornham	1,005.78	1,173.40	1,341.03	1,508.66
Tilney All Saints	1,032.54	1,204.62	1,376.71	1,548.80
Tilney St Lawrence	1,004.12	1,171.47	1,338.82	1,506.17
Titchwell	986.64	1,151.07	1,315.51	1,479.95
Tottenhill	998.60	1,165.03	1,331.46	1,497.89
Upwell	1,007.64	1,175.57	1,343.51	1,511.45
Walpole	998.18	1,164.54	1,330.90	1,497.26
Walpole Cross Keys	1,015.11	1,184.29	1,353.48	1,522.66
Walpole Highway	1,003.44	1,170.68	1,337.92	1,505.16
Walsoken	989.66	1,154.61	1,319.55	1,484.49
Watlington	1,008.12	1,176.13	1,344.15	1,512.17
Welney	1,016.76	1,186.22	1,355.68	1,525.14
Wereham	1,013.28	1,182.15	1,351.03	1,519.91
West Acre	984.44	1,148.51	1,312.58	1,476.65
West Dereham	1,049.14	1,224.00	1,398.85	1,573.71
West Rudham	1,005.52	1,173.11	1,340.69	1,508.28
West Walton	1,004.57	1,172.00	1,339.42	1,506.85
West Winch	997.82	1,164.12	1,330.42	1,496.72
Wiggenhall St Germans	1,000.64	1,167.41	1,334.18	1,500.95
Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalen	1,023.63	1,194.23	1,364.84	1,535.44
Wimbotsham	1,020.04	1,190.05	1,360.05	1,530.06
Wormegay	1,009.69	1,177.97	1,346.25	1,514.53
Wretton	994.93	1,160.75	1,326.57	1,492.39

COUNCIL TAX 2015/2016
(Local Government Finance Act 1992 Section 30(2))

Parish	Valuation Bands			
	E (5)	F (6)	G (7)	H (8)
	£p	£p	£p	£p
Nordelph	1,851.66	2,188.33	2,525.00	3,030.00
North Creake	1,876.79	2,218.03	2,559.27	3,071.12
North Runcton	1,834.99	2,168.63	2,502.27	3,002.72
Northwold	1,853.25	2,190.21	2,527.17	3,032.60
North Wootton	1,840.19	2,174.77	2,509.35	3,011.22
Old Hunstanton	1,831.66	2,164.68	2,497.72	2,997.26
Outwell	1,817.70	2,148.19	2,478.69	2,974.42
Pentney	1,872.98	2,213.52	2,554.07	3,064.88
Ringstead	1,852.35	2,189.14	2,525.94	3,031.12
Roydon	1,840.03	2,174.58	2,509.14	3,010.96
Runcton Holme	1,847.64	2,183.58	2,519.52	3,023.42
Ryston	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Sandringham	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Sedgeford	1,829.22	2,161.81	2,494.40	2,993.28
Shernborne	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Shouldham	1,852.01	2,188.73	2,525.47	3,030.56
Shouldham Thorpe	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Snettisham	1,889.96	2,233.58	2,577.22	3,092.66
South Creake	1,847.11	2,182.94	2,518.79	3,022.54
Southery	1,862.80	2,201.49	2,540.19	3,048.22
South Wootton	1,862.98	2,201.70	2,540.44	3,048.52
Stanhoe	1,854.73	2,191.95	2,529.19	3,035.02
Stoke Ferry	1,846.04	2,181.68	2,517.34	3,020.80
Stow Bardolph	1,833.49	2,166.85	2,500.22	3,000.26
Stradsett	1,791.58	2,117.32	2,443.07	2,931.68
Syderstone	1,844.94	2,180.38	2,515.84	3,019.00
Terrington St Clement	1,891.00	2,234.81	2,578.64	3,094.36
Terrington St John	1,842.69	2,177.73	2,512.77	3,015.32
Thornham	1,843.92	2,179.17	2,514.44	3,017.32
Tilney All Saints	1,892.98	2,237.15	2,581.34	3,097.60
Tilney St Lawrence	1,840.87	2,175.57	2,510.29	3,012.34
Titchwell	1,808.83	2,137.70	2,466.59	2,959.90
Tottenhill	1,830.75	2,163.61	2,496.49	2,995.78
Upwell	1,847.33	2,183.20	2,519.09	3,022.90
Walpole	1,829.98	2,162.70	2,495.44	2,994.52
Walpole Cross Keys	1,861.03	2,199.39	2,537.77	3,045.32
Walpole Highway	1,839.64	2,174.12	2,508.60	3,010.32
Walsoken	1,814.37	2,144.26	2,474.15	2,968.98
Watlington	1,848.21	2,184.24	2,520.29	3,024.34
Welney	1,864.06	2,202.98	2,541.90	3,050.28
Wereham	1,857.67	2,195.42	2,533.19	3,039.82
West Acre	1,804.79	2,132.93	2,461.09	2,953.30
West Dereham	1,923.42	2,273.13	2,622.85	3,147.42
West Rudham	1,843.45	2,178.62	2,513.80	3,016.56
West Walton	1,841.70	2,176.56	2,511.42	3,013.70
West Winch	1,829.32	2,161.92	2,494.54	2,993.44
Wiggenhall St Germans	1,834.49	2,168.03	2,501.59	3,001.90
Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalen	1,876.65	2,217.85	2,559.07	3,070.88
Wimbotsham	1,870.07	2,210.08	2,550.10	3,060.12
Wormegay	1,851.09	2,187.65	2,524.22	3,029.06
Wretton	1,824.03	2,155.67	2,487.32	2,984.78