Summary of comments by Parish Councils regarding proposed changes to Financial Arrangements.

comments, full letter attached will put an unfair burden on Parish Councils win are already under great pressure to reduce their own expenses. This Council is not opposed to the strengthening of the Terms and Conditions for Special Works Projects, as this will ensure the money is well spend and in accordance with priorities. East Malling & Larkfield least Peckham hadlow with priorities. In o written comments received least Peckham hadlow with priorities on whiten comments received west the increased costs of providing the current level of service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of parishes in the coming financial year, we consider the proposed 0.4% penalises us unfairly for the following reasons: 1) The Consumer Price Index is likely to exceed 4% and the Retail Price Index is likely to exceed 5%. 2) Gas and electricity costs have increased by over 20%. 3) Providers of supplies and services such as our playing fields maintenance are likely to be seeking an increase close to inflation. 4) Salary and wages increases are likely to be around 2%. We assume TMBC budgets will not be using 0.4% as the likely increase in rates next year and the question of double taxation for people living in parishes no doubt will be raised by aggrieved residents living in our area if we were to fully fund the increase over and above 0.4%. For that reason we suggest that whatever percentage TMBC decides to increase the rates by it includes half the increase to uplift parishes' annual allocation as detailed in your letter, e.g. TMBC rate rise 4%; parish increase support 2%. Hildenborough no written comments received Mereworth no written comments received Acknowledged - no comments row own own of the following reasons: Acknowledged - no comments row own own own own own own own own own o	Arrangements.	no commente
Birling Borough Green Acknowledged - no comments Burham Ditton Summarised Comments, full better attached will be seem that the Government's cost cutting imposed on Borough Councils, is in turn being passed on to Parishes, who can ill afford the cuts. Including the Scheme of Financial Arrangements with Parish Councils in the cut back will put an unfair burden on Parish Councils who are already under great pressure to reduce their own expenses. This Council is not opposed to the strengthening of the Terms and Conditions for Special Works Projects, as this will ensure the money is well spend and in accordance with priorities. East Malling & Larkfield Bast Peckham Wester attached on written comments received no written comments received no written comments received Nester attached or ments, full felter attached or ments are constant to the increased costs of providing the current level of service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of parishes in the coming financial year, we consider the proposed 0.4% penalises us unfairly for the following reasons: 1) The Consumer Price Index is likely to exceed 4% and the Retail Price Index is likely to exceed 5%. 2) Gas and electricity costs have increased by over 20%. 3) Providers of supplies and services such as our playing fields maintenance are likely to be seeking an increase close to inflation. 4) Salary and wages increases close to inflation. 4) Salary and wages increases are likely to be around 2%. We assume TMBC budgets will not be using 0.4% as the likely increase in rates next year and the question of double taxation for people living in parishes no doubt will be raised by aggrieved residents living in our area if we were to fully fund the increase over and above 0.4%. For that reason we suggest that whatever percentage TMBC decides to increase the rates by it includes half the increase to uplift parishes' annual allocation as detailed in your letter, e.g. TMBC rate rise 4%; parish increase support		
Borough Green Burham Ditton Summarised comments, full letter attached letter attached Basham Ditton Summarised comments, full letter attached no written comments received We share your concern that the government's allocation is woefully inadequate to meet the increased costs of providing the current level of service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of parishes in the coming financial year, we consider the proposed 0.4% penalises us unfairly for the following reasons: 1) The Consumer Price Index is likely to exceed 4% and the Retail Price Index is likely to exceed 5%. 2) Gas and electricity costs have increased by over 20%. 3) Providers of supplies and services such as our playing fields maintenance are likely to be seeking an increase close to inflation. 4) Salary and wages increases are likely to be around 2%. We assume TMBC budgets will not be using 0.4% as the likely increase in rates next year and the question of double taxation for people living in parishes no doubt will be raised by aggrieved residents living in our area if we were to fully fund the increase over and above 0.4%. For that reason we suggest that whatever percentage TMBC decides to increase the rates by it includes half the increase to uplift parishes's annual allocation as detailed in your letter, e.g. TMBC rate rise 4%; parish increase support 2%. Hildenborough no written comments received no written comments received Nereworth no written comments received Nereworth no written comments received Acknowledged - no comments received Acknowledged - no comments received Nachnowled - no		
Ditton Ditton Summarised comments, full letter attached It seems that the Government's cost cutting imposed on Borough Councils, is in turn being passed on to Parishes, who can ill afford the cuts. Including the Scheme of Financial Arrangements with Parish Councils in the cut back will put an unfair burden on Parish Councils who are already under great pressure to reduce their own expenses. This Council is not opposed to the strengthening of the Terms and Conditions for Special Works Projects, as this will ensure the money is well spend and in accordance with priorities. East Malling & Larkfield East Peckham Hadlow Summarised comments, full letter attached In owritten comments received We share your concern that the government's allocation is woefully inadequate to meet the increased costs of providing the current level of service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of parishes in the coming financial year, we consider the proposed 0.4% penalises us unfairly for the following reasons: 1) The Consumer Price Index is likely to exceed 4% and the Retail Price Index is likely to exceed 5%. 2) Gas and electricity costs have increased by over 20%. 3) Providers of supplies and services such as our playing fields maintenance are likely to be seeking an increase close to inflation. 4) Salary and wages increases are likely to be around 2%. We assume TMBC budgets will not be using 0.4% as the likely increase in rates next year and the question of double taxation for people living in parishes no doubt will be raised by aggrieved residents living in our area if we were to fully fund the increase over and above 0.4%. For that reason we suggest that whatever percentage TMBC decides to increase the rates by it includes half the increase to uplift parishes' annual allocation as detailed in your letter, e.g. TMBC rate rise 4%; parish increase support 2%. Hillidenborough no written comments received in owritten comments received Acknowledged - no comments roceived		
Ditton Summarised comments, full letter attached letter attach		
Summarised comments, full lafter attached laft		
East Malling & Larkfield East Peckham Hadlow Summarised comments, full whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of parishes in the coming financial year, we consider the proposed 0.4% penalises us unfairly for the following reasons: 1) The Consumer Price Index is likely to exceed 4% and the Retail Price Index is likely to exceed 5%. 2) Gas and electricity costs have increased by over 20%. 3) Providers of supplies and services such as our playing fields maintenance are likely to be seeking an increase close to inflation. 4) Salary and wages increases are likely to be around 2%. We assume TMBC budgets will not be using 0.4% as the likely increase in rates next year and the question of double taxation for people living in parishes no doubt will be raised by aggrieved residents living in our area if we were to fully fund the increase over and above 0.4%. For that reason we suggest that whatever percentage TMBC decides to increase the rates by it includes half the increase to uplift parishes' annual allocation as detailed in your letter, e.g. TMBC rate rise 4%; parish increase support 2%. hildenborough no written comments received Kings Hill no written comments received Kings Hill no written comments received Offham no written comments received Offham no written comments received Platt no written comments received Platt no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Shippourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received West Malling no written comments received West Malling no written comments received West Malling no written comments received West Peckham no written comments received mo comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding no written comments received	Summarised comments, full letter attached	being passed on to Parishes, who can ill afford the cuts. Including the Scheme of Financial Arrangements with Parish Councils in the cut back will put an unfair burden on Parish Councils who are already under great pressure to reduce their own expenses. This Council is not opposed to the strengthening of the Terms and Conditions for Special Works Projects, as this will ensure the money is well spend and in accordance
We share your concern that the government's allocation is woefully inadequate to meet the increased costs of providing the current level of service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of parishes in the coming financial year, we consider the proposed 0.4% penalises us unfairly for the following reasons: 1) The Consumer Price Index is likely to exceed 4% and the Retail Price Index is likely to exceed 5%. 2) Gas and electricity costs have increased by over 20%. 3) Providers of supplies and services such as our playing fields maintenance are likely to be seeking an increase close to inflation. 4) Salary and wages increases are likely to be around 2%. We assume TMBC budgets will not be using 0.4% as the likely increase in rates next year and the question of double taxation for people living in parishes no doubt will be raised by aggrieved residents living in our area if we were to fully fund the increase over and above 0.4%. For that reason we suggest that whatever percentage TMBC decides to increase the rates by it includes half the increase to uplift parishes' annual allocation as detailed in your letter, e.g. TMBC rate rise 4%; parish increase support 2%. Hildenborough no written comments received Ightham no written comments received Mereworth no written comments received Mereworth no written comments received Mereworth no written comments received Platt no written comments received Platt no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received West Malling no written comments received West Malling no written comments received West Malling no written comments received mo written comme	East Malling & Larkfield	
meet the increased costs of providing the current level of service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of people in service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of people in service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of people in services were also as a complete in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of people in our area is serviced. 1) The Consumer Price Index is likely to exceed 4% and the Retail Price Index is likely to exceed 5%. 2) Gas and electricity costs have increased by over 20%. 3) Providers of supplies and services such as our playing fields maintenance are likely to be seeking an increase close to inflation. 4) Salary and wages increases are likely to be around 2%. We assume TMBC budgets will not be using 0.4% as the likely increase in rates next year and the question of double taxation for people living in parishes no doubt will be raised by aggrieved residents living in our area if we were to fully fund the increase over and above 0.4%. For that reason we suggest that whatever percentage TMBC decides to increase the rates by it includes half the increase to uplift parishes' annual allocation as detailed in your letter, e.g. TMBC rate rise 4%; parish increase support 2%. Hildenborough In owritten comments received Kings Hill In owritten comments received Mereworth In owritten comments received Mereworth In owritten comments received Mereworth In owritten comments received Plaxtol In owritten comments received Plaxtol In owritten comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe In owritten comments received West Malling In owritten comments received West Malling In owritten comments received West Peckham In owritten comments received Wouldham In owritten comments received	East Peckham	no written comments received
Ightham no written comments received Kings Hill no written comments received Leybourne no written comments received Mereworth no written comments received Offham no written comments received Platt no written comments received Plaxtol no written comments received Ryarsh no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received	Hadlow Summarised comments, full letter attached	meet the increased costs of providing the current level of service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of parishes in the coming financial year, we consider the proposed 0.4% penalises us unfairly for the following reasons: 1) The Consumer Price Index is likely to exceed 4% and the Retail Price Index is likely to exceed 5%. 2) Gas and electricity costs have increased by over 20%. 3) Providers of supplies and services such as our playing fields maintenance are likely to be seeking an increase close to inflation. 4) Salary and wages increases are likely to be around 2%. We assume TMBC budgets will not be using 0.4% as the likely increase in rates next year and the question of double taxation for people living in parishes no doubt will be raised by aggrieved residents living in our area if we were to fully fund the increase over and above 0.4%. For that reason we suggest that whatever percentage TMBC decides to increase the rates by it includes half the increase to uplift parishes' annual allocation as detailed in your letter, e.g. TMBC rate rise 4%; parish increase support
Kings Hill no written comments received Leybourne no written comments received Mereworth no written comments received Offham no written comments received Platt no written comments received Plaxtol no written comments received Ryarsh no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received	Hildenborough	
Kings Hill no written comments received Leybourne no written comments received Mereworth no written comments received Offham no written comments received Platt no written comments received Plaxtol no written comments received Ryarsh no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received	Ightham	no written comments received
Leybourne no written comments received Mereworth no written comments received Offham no written comments received Platt no written comments received Plaxtol no written comments received Ryarsh no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		
Mereworth no written comments received Offham no written comments received Platt no written comments received Plaxtol no written comments received Ryarsh no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received Wateringbury no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		
Offham no written comments received Platt no written comments received Plaxtol no written comments received Ryarsh no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received	Mereworth	
Platt no written comments received Plaxtol no written comments received Ryarsh no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		
Plaxtol no written comments received Ryarsh no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		
Ryarsh no written comments received Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		
Shipbourne Acknowledged - no comments Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		
Snodland no written comments received Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received	-	
Stansted Acknowledged - no comments Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received	•	· ·
Trottiscliffe no written comments received Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		
Wateringbury no written comments received West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		•
West Malling no comments but expressed their sympathies for the position in which the Borough Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		
Council finds itself because of reductions in Government funding West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received		
West Peckham no written comments received Wouldham no written comments received	vvesi Maiiilig	
Wouldham no written comments received	West Peckham	<u> </u>
Mrotham Acknowledged no comments	Wouldham	
wrotham Acknowledged - no comments	Wrotham	Acknowledged - no comments



DITTON PARISH COUNCIL

The Community Centre

Kilnbarn Road, DITTON, Aylesford, Kent, ME20 6AH

Clerk of the Council: Sue Kavanagh

Tel: 01732 844749 + Fax: 01732 845572

VAT Reg. No: 204 961474

Mr F Gahan Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council Gibson Building

Kings Hill
West Malling
Kent ME19 4LZ

12th August 2008

Dear Mr Gahan



FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH PARISH COUNCILS 2008/2009

Thank you for your communication of 5^{th} August 2008 regarding changes to the method of applying annual increases under the scheme of financial arrangements with Parish Councils.

It seems that the Government's cost cutting imposed on Borough Councils, is in turn being passed on to Parishes, who can ill afford the cuts.

Compared to last year this Council's total allocation will be down by £152.32 but the annual increase in the Consumer Price Index for August 2008 is likely to be higher than last year so parishes will get a "double whammy".

The reason for the cutback is given as "...reduction in Central Government support and the imposition of Council Tax Capping". This Council would like to know if the Borough Council has been capped and how it has calculated the "funding gap of £500.000"?

This Council would also like to ask why the Borough Council is suggesting that the Scheme of Financial Arrangements with Parish Councils be included in the cut back? This will put an unfair burden on Parish Councils who are already under great pressure to reduce their own expenses. The Parish Council would like to have details of the other "budget areas" being considered for cutbacks?

This Council is not opposed to the strengthening of the Terms and Conditions for Special Works Projects, as this will ensure the money is well spend and in accordance with priorities.

Yours sincerely

Sue (Lowarage

(Mrs) Sue Kavanagh Clerk of the Council

QUALITY PARISH COUNCIL

Hadlow Parish Council

The Parish Office Hadlow Old School Hall Hadlow Kent TN110EH

PHONE 01732 851878 E-MAIL <u>marylinapps@hadlowpc.co.uk</u>

Hadlow Parish Council Web site: www.hadlowpc-kent.org.uk

Your ref: F/3/PR.42.8

13 August 2008

Mr Francis Gahan
Financial Services
Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council
Gibson Building
Gibson Drive
Kings Hill, West Malling
ME19 4LZ

Dear Mr Gahan,

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH PARISH COUNCILS 2009/10

In reply to your letter dated 5th August 2008 which was considered at our Parish Council meeting on 11th August, we share your concern that the government's allocation of financial assistance to Kent and its district councils is woefully inadequate to meet the increased costs of providing the current level of service to people in our area. Whereas we accept that you may not be in a position to fully fund the needs of parishes in the coming financial year, we consider the proposed 0.4% penalises us unfairly for the following reasons:

- 1. The Consumer Price Index is likely to exceed 4% and the Retail Price Index is likely to exceed 5%.
- 2. Gas and electricity costs have increased by over 20%.
- 3. Providers of supplies and services such as our playing fields maintenance are likely to be seeking an increase close to inflation.
- 4. Salary and wages increases are likely to be around 2%.

We assume TMBC budgets will not be using 0.4% as the likely increase in rates next year and the question of double taxation for people living in parishes no doubt will be raised by aggrieved residents living in our area if we were to fully fund the increase over and above 0.4%. For that reason we suggest that whatever percentage TMBC decides to increase the rates by it includes half the increase to uplift parishes' annual allocation as detailed in your letter, e.g. TMBC rate rise 4%; parish increase support 2%.

We are also concerned that not all parishes meet in August and we suggest that parishes are given more time to respond and in any case we would ask that the item is placed on the Parish Partnership Agenda on 11^{th} September.

Yours sincerely,

Marylin Apps Clerk Hadlow Parish Council