

**Minutes of a meeting of Council
held on Wednesday, 2nd March, 2022
from 7.00 pm - 9.00 pm**

Present: M Belsey (Chairman)
P Coote (Vice-Chair)

J Ash-Edwards	B Dempsey	G Marsh
R Bates	J Edwards	J Mockford
J Belsey	R Eggleston	A Peacock
A Bennett	A Eves	C Phillips
L Bennett	B Forbes	M Pulfer
P Brown	L Gibbs	S Smith
R Cartwright	I Gibson	A Sparasci
P Chapman	J Henwood	L Stockwell
R Clarke	S Hicks	D Sweatman
E Coe-	S Hillier	C Trumble
Gunnell White	R Jackson	N Walker
M Cornish	J Knight	R Webb
R Cromie	Andrew Lea	N Webster
J Dabell	Anthea Lea	R Whittaker
R de Mierre		

Absent: Councillors G Allen, A Boutrup, P Bradbury, H Brunsdon, S Ellis, S Hatton, T Hussain, C Laband, J Llewellyn-Burke and R Salisbury

1. OPENING PRAYER.

The opening prayer was read by the Vice-Chairman.

The Chairman expressed sympathy to all families suffering in Ukraine. The Leader of the Council made a statement of support for the Ukrainian people, acknowledging that the rest of the world has been inspired by the courage shown by them during this time of aggression. He stated his intention to write to the Ambassador to express solidarity and to write to the Prime Minister to urge the Government to do all it can to support Ukraine. The three Group Leaders echoed the statements of solidarity with Ukraine and urged the Government to do all it can in terms of economic sanctions and humanitarian aid.

2. TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.

The following question was received from Mr Kenward and was read by the Chairman in his absence.

With the NHS likely to be vacating Clair Hall soon and the Steering Group findings not expected to be known until September. What plans have council made to facilitate the venues return to use in line with the Court Order of the 13th of January 2020 which states, 'nothing shall prejudice the use of Clair Hall as a vaccination centre or require it to be opened contrary to law.' Do members regret allowing the wrecking amendments made to the motion tabled by the Lib Dems on the 29th of September 2021 which if adopted would've catered for this very scenario?

The following response was provided by the Leader, Cllr Jonathan Ash-Edwards:
Thank you for your question.

Since December 2020 there has been a meanwhile use in operation with the NHS using Clair Hall. Today the Council has announced it had extended a licence for the NHS to use the Clair Hall site in Haywards Heath as a Covid-19 vaccination centre. The NHS has been vaccinating local residents against Covid-19 at the Clair Hall site since December 2020 and has delivered an incredible 194,000 jabs so far. The new licence will run until February 2024 and will allow NHS to continue delivering this important service.

I'm really pleased to see the licence extension will enable the NHS to provide additional primary care services alongside vaccinations to support the community's health needs.

Also, I would like to highlight that the use of Clair Hall as a vaccination centre is a temporary measure and Mid Sussex District Council is continuing to explore all the options for providing modern new sustainable community facilities on the site for the benefit of local residents. The Council has agreed an evidence-based approach to look at how this could be delivered on the Clair Hall site and this work should be unaffected by the extension of the licence.

The following question was received from Ms Wilcock:

Please advise why, although it has been announced nationally and Mid Sussex District Council have been formally notified that Clair Hall is now officially on the Theatres Trust At Risk Register, (a statutory body) there has been no mention of this material fact in any Council report or statement.

The following response was provided by the Leader, Cllr Jonathan Ash-Edwards:
Thank you for your question. This allows me to clarify some of the issues around the status of the Clair Hall. How the Theatres Trust communicate is a matter for them. The Council wasn't informed or consulted by the Theatres Trust on their decision to list Clair Hall and it was surprised. The Council wrote to the Trust to clarify the status of the hall as a community facility, and that we were surprised to see it added to the list.

In particular, it was very disappointing to see that factually incorrect information has been put in the public domain by the Theatres Trust stating that the Council was considering selling the site. In fact in December, the Cabinet opted to keep the community facilities on the site and agreed further, evidence-based work to develop investment options to ensure sustainable provision of the community facilities on the site.

The Director of the Theatres Trust has apologised for the factually incorrect information they have put in the public domain.

The Council hopes the Theatres Trust will correct their information and engage positively with our evidence-based approach to this work.

Ms Wilcock asked a supplementary question to clarify if you are still regarding Clair Hall as a theatre or performance space and therefore any replacement facilities will have performance based facilities.

The Leader agreed to provide a written response.

The following question was received from Mr Kingsley-Young and read by the Chairman in his absence.

Having come under rightful criticism both by your electorate on social media and by other members of council, how will the steering committee ensure impartiality and transparency over the feasibility study into Clair Hall to ensure that any examination or result isn't contaminated by the group's bias towards demolition and redevelopment?

The following response was provided by the Leader, Cllr Jonathan Ash-Edwards:
Just before Christmas, the Cabinet agreed to undertake evidence-led work to examine all the options, in order to deliver modern, future proof community facilities on the Clair Hall site.

Last month the Cabinet established a new Member Steering Group to provide oversight and guidance as detailed options are investigated. This will be a joint group with Haywards Heath Town Council and I would like to thank the Town Council for their involvement in the work. This is the same governance structure that the Council has used for projects in Burgess Hill involving Burgess Hill Town Council.

The development of options will be advised by a number of specialists, including an external specialist advisor with experience in the arts, culture and leisure sector. Using their expertise, they will coordinate market research, engagement and analysis to develop detailed proposals for review by the Member Steering Group. I will not compromise on the goal which is as per the mandate of the public consultation where 95% of people wanted change and modernisation and improvement on site. We will work to provide a modern fit-for-purpose community entertainment provision on this site.

The following question was received from Ms Weinstein:

I am Jenny Weinstein from Mid Sussex Climate Coalition. According to a report by UK Climate Emergency <https://councilclimatescorecards.uk/> which measured the plans of Local Councils on climate change, MSDC scored 20 where other District Councils such as Stroud and East Devon scored 77 and 78 respectively. We understand that a Sustainability Strategy for Mid Sussex will be considered by the Council shortly. We are aware that businesses were consulted about the economic impact of the strategy but how were residents, community groups and environmental groups consulted about the environmental and ecological aspects of development of the strategy?

The following response was provided by Councillor J Belsey:

Thank you for your question.

There has for over a year now been a variety of dialogues and conversations happening that have and will continue to inform the development of this important strategy and as we move forward, its delivery.

From 12 November to 6 December 2020 the Council in partnership with the County Council and the Local Government Association's Local Partnership's LLP, undertook a district wide survey to capture the views and behaviours of residents in relation to climate actions. A total of 2397 responses were received.

The public engagement sought and received views on:

- The best approaches for the Council to communicate and engage with a wide range of audiences, around the topics of climate change
- How COVID-19 has impacted on resident behaviours, particularly in relation to "climate actions" which reduce emissions
- How residents could be encouraged to make changes to their behaviour to reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

The results of this engagement had informed the strategy as it has developed and has been supplemented with feedback from a wide range of meetings with community stakeholder organisations and forums throughout 2021 including, but not limited to, the Mid Sussex Partnership and its subgroups, community fora hosted by Mid Sussex Voluntary Action and the Sussex Nature Partnership.

As we move towards the detail of delivery of the strategy it will be essential that we continue and grow that conversation. This is an incredibly important strategy for our District and we recognise that for it to succeed we need to work in partnership – that will include working with groups like the Mid Sussex Climate Coalition to identify and deliver the many actions that will be required to ensure we have a vibrant District that is attractive, resilient and innovative that balances social well-being, environmental protection and sustainable economic growth. I look forward to continuing that conversation with you in the weeks and months ahead.

Ms Weinstein asked a supplementary question, thanking the Cabinet Member for the positive response and noting that a new report from the International Committee on Climate Change came out yesterday warning that climate change is happening much faster and more frequently with more severe weather events than had been anticipated at this stage. She asked how urgently and how soon this partnership will be set up with the local community and environmental groups to actually implement the plan which has yet to be passed.

The Cabinet Member agreed to provide a written response.

3. TO CONFIRM MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 26 JANUARY 2022.

The minutes of the meeting of Council held on 26 January 2022 were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

4. TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS IN RESPECT OF ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA.

Councillor Eggleston declared an interest regarding the first amendment proposed to item 9 – Corporate Plan and Budget 2022/23 as it relates to Burgess Hill and he is Leader of Burgess Hill Town Council.

5. TO CONSIDER ANY ITEMS THAT THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL AGREES TO TAKE AS URGENT BUSINESS.

The Chairman agreed to take an urgent item which was tabled at the meeting. A decision by the Council was required in the next week and well before the next Council meeting.

PROCUREMENT OF AN EXTERNAL AUDITOR

Councillor Pulfer moved the item as Chairman of the Audit Committee and it was seconded by Councillor Cromie.

The Chairman took Members to the recommendation as contained in the report which was agreed with a clear majority.

RESOLVED

The Council agreed to:

Join in the nationwide PSAA procurement for an external auditor with the contract starting 1st April 2023 and running to 2028.

6. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

The Chairman spoke of her attendance at recent events, as detailed on the website noting particularly the opening of Marne Court by Clarion Housing.

7. APPOINTMENT OF THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL.

Councillor Ash-Edwards nominated Councillor John Belsey as Deputy Leader of the Council. This was seconded by Councillor Webster.

The Leader noted that there would be consequential changes to portfolios which will be circulated shortly to all Members, and that it was his intention to return the Cabinet number to 7 Cabinet Members at the Annual Council in May 2022.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the appointment which was agreed with a clear majority.

RESOLVED

That Councillor John Belsey be appointed Deputy Leader of the Council for the remainder of the 2021/22 Council year.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET HELD ON 14 FEBRUARY 2022.

Councillor Ash-Edwards moved the item, noting that the intention is to improve the financial position in relation to the deficit and bring it back into balance as soon as possible. In response to a question on the reasons for (and governance of) the efficiency specific reserve he noted that such reserves are to allow the Council to invest in service improvement and efficiencies, quite often on an invest-to-save basis and therefore they need to be pump-primed.

The item was seconded by Councillor J Belsey. The Chairman took Members to the recommendations as contained in the report which were agreed with a clear majority.

RESOLVED

Council agreed:

- (i) That the use of the JE/Redundancy Specific Reserve be amended as detailed in paragraph 26 of the Cabinet report;
- (ii) That £200,000 be transferred to the Efficiency Specific Reserve as detailed in paragraph 27 of the Cabinet report;
- (iii) that £11,193 grant income relating to New Burdens LA Data Sharing Programme and the Housing Benefit Award Accuracy Initiative be transferred to Specific Reserves as detailed in paragraphs 28 of the Cabinet report;
- (iv) that £63,409 grant income relating to Self Isolation Administration costs be transferred to Specific Reserves as detailed in paragraphs 29 of the Cabinet report;
- (v) that £100,500 grant income relating to Discretionary Self Isolation be transferred to Specific Reserves as detailed in paragraphs 30 of the Cabinet report;
- (vi) that £25,000 grant income relating to Rough Sleeping RSI 4 be transferred to Specific Reserves as detailed in paragraphs 31 of the Cabinet report;
- (vii) that £100,100 grant income relating to New Burdens 4 Restart and Additional Restrictions Covid-19 be transferred to Specific Reserves as detailed in paragraphs 32 of the Cabinet report;
- (viii) that £18,600 grant income relating to New Burdens 5 Post Payment Assurance, Reconciliation and Debt Recovery be transferred to Specific Reserves as detailed in paragraphs 33 of the Cabinet report;
- (ix) that £59,093 grant income relating to Covid-19 Test and Trace Contain Management Outbreak Fund (COMF) be transferred to Specific Reserves as detailed in paragraphs 34 of the Cabinet report;
- (x) that £70,000 grant income relating to Economic Recovery Fund be transferred to Specific Reserves as detailed in paragraphs 35 of the Cabinet report;
- (xi) the variations to the Capital Programme contained in paragraph 44 of the Cabinet report in accordance with the Council's Financial Procedure rule B3.

9. CORPORATE PLAN AND BUDGET FOR 2022/23.

The Leader moved the item thanking the Scrutiny Committee who considered it in detail in January with cross party support. He confirmed that it is a delivery focused Budget centred on residents' priorities as the Council recovers from the impact of the pandemic. He acknowledged that there is a continuing need to bring the budget back into balance whilst delivering front line services. The Council will continue to support Leisure Centres whilst working to phase out the subsidies as soon as possible. He also noted that the Budget keeps Council Tax at the third lowest in Sussex and in

April the Council will begin to administer £150 Council Tax Rebate to lowest income families.

The Leader highlighted a number of commitments being brought forward, including 3000 households taking part in a pilot for food waste collection and the new Sustainable Economic Strategy to set the Council on a path to Net Zero. It is also a critical year for delivering an ambitious parks and open spaces programme and the master planning for the Centre for Outdoor Sports, the biggest investment in sports for a generation. Other commitments include new modern facilities at Clair Hall, playground improvements, the continuation of the Full Fibre project to support small businesses, residents and the local economy, and the acquisition of temporary accommodation and increased homelessness intervention officers to support those who need it. The item was seconded by the Deputy Leader.

A number of Members commended the budget, noting that it is a Budget and Corporate Plan for the District as a whole. It was acknowledged that it is unusual to have a budget that relies on the use of reserves and concern was raised over the projection to use reserves in 2025/26. It was noted that in the past the Council had good management of reserves for just this circumstance which has enabled it to be in a position to respond in an agile way throughout the pandemic, however attention should be given to reducing the draw on reserves as soon as possible. The Leader confirmed that the position is improving gradually and is closely under review by the Cabinet. Use of the reserves does support the capital programme and it is important to ensure they are replenished to a healthy level.

A number of Members commented on the aspirational nature of the Corporate Plan and Budget, noting that it provides significant support to the local economy in terms of full fibre provision and support for an increase in local employment as well as increased green space provision which is crucial to wellbeing.

A Member raised concern over the events that have happened since the figures were compiled for the budget at the end of 2021, noting that there is a provision for inflation at 2% but evidence that Unions will demand more than this. An increase in fuel charges and cost of food may also impair the ability of people to pay the expected amount of Council Tax. In response to a question on the Council's contingency plans for this, the Leader acknowledged that the budget is dynamic to account for this, citing the agility in responding to the changes during the pandemic as an example. He noted that there may be a need to draw more on reserves if there was an issue, and the increased cost of fuel will be kept under review with mitigating factors put in place to improve energy efficiency. Regarding the risk of lower Council Tax collection, this is mitigated by the collection fund which goes to all the precepting Authorities and the Council's share should be 10%. Support will also be provided to those residents who need it. In response to discussion around inflation, a Member requested that consideration be given to consider sharing any Officer pay rise equally as an absolute and equal amount rather than a percentage increase, to benefit those that are paid the least.

Councillor Eggleston proposed an amendment in relation to a Burgess Hill Town Centre Support Fund which seeks to redeploy funds already given by New River to improve the town centre and The Martlets site from its current unacceptable condition. This was seconded by Councillor Hicks who noted that original planning application for the Martlets redevelopment was 7 years ago with nothing having been done since, also highlighting that it forms part of the District Council's property portfolio. The amendment is detailed below:

Noting this Council's aim to “maintain, and where possible, improve the social, economic and environmental well-being of our District and the quality of life for all, now and in the future” (see Mid Sussex Sustainable Communities Strategy); and

Noting the considerable delay in the regeneration of the Martlets Shopping Centre, Burgess Hill and the blight that has resulted in this part of Burgess Hill's town centre;

Establish a Specific Reserve to support environmental, economic and social improvements to mitigate the blight and improve the quality of life of residents, and transfer £100,000 from the General Reserve to this Specific Reserve.

The Specific Reserve will be for projects identified through a group comprising of officers from Burgess Hill Town Council and Mid Sussex District Council and subject to agreement under Financial Regulation B4.4 in consultation with the Cabinet Member.

Discussion was held on the way in which the amendment was presented, noting that the Leader was made aware a few weeks prior to the meeting. A number of Members expressed concern that it was not raised at the Scrutiny Committee in January despite encouragement from the Cabinet Member to do so, as this would have allowed for the proper scrutiny to take place. It was also noted that requests for such funds should be accompanied by a relevant business case as the Council does not have sufficient information on what the funds will be used for. A number of Members agreed on the aspirational nature of the amendment, as the town centre needs improvement but noted that the Town Council had not increased its own budget or precept to accommodate the work, and that any request at District Level should have been proposed during the budget forming stages. The Leader acknowledged that he is not against spending money on sensible proposals but reiterated the usual process for such considerations where a project is identified with a business case provided to consider budget proposals.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the amendment which was lost with 18 in favour, 23 against and 2 abstentions.

Councillor Henwood proposed a second amendment related to the installation of a Changing Places Toilet in the Orchards Shopping Centre, citing the Leader's comment that the budget ‘will focus on what is important to our residents and will support vulnerable people in the community’. This was seconded by Councillor Alison Bennett who confirmed it was based on discussions with the Section 151 Officer and in the spirit of cross party working, and is detailed below:

Noting that there are currently no Changing Places toilets in the town centre of Haywards Heath and to ensure that this Council creates environments that are accessible to all members of the community:

Purchase and install a modular Changing Places toilet in the Orchards Shopping Centre in Haywards Heath, at a cost of £100,000 drawn from the general reserve.

Discussion was held on the need to have clean and fit-for-purpose toilet facilities, and the need to improve the current provision at the Orchards Shopping Centre. Discussion was also held on the methods that Members can bring about amendments to the budget, the scrutiny work programmes, and cross party working. It was highlighted that work is already underway to move the current toilets, following

consultation with residents and the Kangaroos disability charity, and that provision for such facilities is likely to cost in excess of the £100k requested. The Leader noted that it was mentioned at the Cabinet meeting on 14 February and a report will come to Cabinet later this month and then to Council in order to provide a Changes Places toilet and new public toilets in Haywards Heath.

In light of this, Councillor Henwood was asked if she wished to withdraw the amendment. As she did not, the Chairman took Members to a vote on the amendment which was lost with 14 in favour, 25 against and 4 abstentions.

As seconder for the main motion, Councillor John Belsey concluded by thanking everyone for their contribution to the debate, and for their input with skills and experience in shaping projects that are coming forward. He noted that there will be challenges ahead but supported the ambitious Corporate Plan and Budget to enable the Council to continue to provide improvements and support to local residents throughout the District.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendations contained in the report. A recorded vote was taken, and the recommendations approved with 29 in favour and 15 against.

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
Ash-Edwards, J.	✓			Gibson, I.	✓		
Bates, R.		✓		Henwood, J.		✓	
Belsey, J.	✓			Hicks, S.		✓	
Belsey, M.	✓			Hillier, S.	✓		
Bennett, A.		✓		Jackson, R.		✓	
Bennett, L.	✓			Knight, J.	✓		
Brown, P.		✓		Lea, Andrew	✓		
Cartwright, R.		✓		Lea, Anthea	✓		
Chapman, P.		✓		Marsh, G	✓		
Clarke, R.	✓			Mockford, J	✓		
Coe-Gunnell White, E.	✓			Peacock, A	✓		
Coote, P.	✓			Phillips, C.	✓		
Cornish, M.		✓		Pulfer, M.	✓		
Cromie, R	✓			Smith, S.	✓		
Dabell, J.	✓			Sparasci, A.		✓	
Dempsey, B		✓		Stockwell, L	✓		
de Mierre, R.	✓			Sweatman, D.	✓		
Edwards, J.		✓		Trumble, C.	✓		
Eggleston, R.		✓		Walker, N	✓		
Eves, A.		✓		Webb, R	✓		
Forbes, B.	✓			Webster, N.	✓		
Gibbs, L.		✓		Whittaker, R.	✓		

RESOLVED

Council agreed:

3.1 Corporate Plan and Budget 2022/23

3.1.1 That the Corporate Plan and Budget for 2022/23 set out in this report be approved;

3.2 Mid Sussex District Council Budget 2022/23

3.2.1 Revenue Spending and MSDC council tax levels for 2022/23:

(a) That Revenue Spending summarised below (see Section 2 for details) is approved:

	£'000
Service Net Expenditure	17,687
Balance Unallocated	20
	<hr/>
Council Net Expenditure	17,707
	<hr/>
Revenue Spending	<u>17,707</u>

(b) That with respect to pensions, the employer's contribution rate should be 21.4% for 2022/23

(c) That the Mid Sussex District Council element of the Council Tax be increased by 2.8% to £180.36, with no requirement to hold a local referendum in accordance with the Act.

3.2.2 Capital Programme 2022/23 (see Section 3 for details):

(a) That the Capital Programme for 2022/23 (as set out in Section 3) is approved.

3.2.3 Usable Reserves and other balances

(a) That the estimates for cash balances (see Section 4 for details) are noted.

3.2.4 Financial Strategy & Medium Term Financial Plan:

(a) That the summary Medium Term Financial Plan to 2025/26 (see Section 5 for details) is noted.

3.2.5 Collection Fund:

(a) That the estimated surplus on the Collection Fund for Council Tax totalling £1,377,000 for the year ended 31 March 2022, of which the Mid Sussex District Council share is £174,550 (see Section 6 for details) is noted.

- (b) That the estimated deficit on the Collection Fund for Business Rates totalling £11,100,373 for the year ended 31 March 2022, of which the Mid Sussex District Council share is £4,440,149 (see Section 6 for details) is noted.

3.3 Council Taxes For The Mid Sussex Area:

3.3.1 It be noted that at its meeting held on 8th December 2021 the Council calculated the following amounts for the year 2022/23:

- (a) 63,230.6 being the amount calculated, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 2012, as its council tax base for the year; and
- (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as set out in Table 3 Section 7 of this report.

3.3.2 £11,404,274 being the amount calculated as the Council Tax Requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2022/23 (excluding Parish Precepts).

3.3.3 That the following amounts be calculated by the Council for the year 2022/23 in accordance with Section 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended by The Localism Act 2011):

- (a) £71,736,938 being the aggregate of the amounts, which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils;
- (b) £55,448,231 being the aggregate of the amounts, which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act;
- (c) £16,288,707 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3.3.3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3.3.3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year;
- (d) £257.61 being the amount at 3.3.3(c) above, all divided by the amount at 3.3.1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts);
- (e) £4,884,433 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish Precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (see Section 7 for details);
- (f) £180.36 being the amount at 3.3.3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3.3.3(e) above by the amount at 3.3.1(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 Parish precept relates;

(g) Part of the Council's area

Parish area	band A £	band B £	band C £	band D £	band E £	band F £	band G £	band H £
Albourne	152.17	177.53	202.89	228.25	278.97	329.69	380.42	456.50
Ansty & Staplefield	171.72	200.34	228.96	257.58	314.82	372.06	429.30	515.16
Ardingly	199.87	233.18	266.49	299.80	366.42	433.04	499.67	599.60
Ashurst Wood	181.61	211.88	242.15	272.42	332.96	393.50	454.03	544.84
Balcombe	179.09	208.93	238.78	268.63	328.33	388.02	447.72	537.26
Bolney	161.66	188.60	215.55	242.49	296.38	350.26	404.15	484.98
Burgess Hill	170.45	198.86	227.27	255.68	312.50	369.32	426.13	511.36
Cuckfield	215.76	251.72	287.68	323.64	395.56	467.48	539.40	647.28
East Grinstead	181.80	212.10	242.40	272.70	333.30	393.90	454.50	545.40
Fulking	166.46	194.20	221.95	249.69	305.18	360.66	416.15	499.38
Hassocks	177.71	207.32	236.94	266.56	325.80	385.03	444.27	533.12
Haywards Heath	158.97	185.46	211.96	238.45	291.44	344.43	397.42	476.90
Horsted Keynes	173.33	202.22	231.11	260.00	317.78	375.56	433.33	520.00
Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common	178.97	208.79	238.62	268.45	328.11	387.76	447.42	536.90
Lindfield	164.24	191.61	218.99	246.36	301.11	355.85	410.60	492.72
Lindfield Rural	149.77	174.73	199.69	224.65	274.57	324.49	374.42	449.30
Newtimber	123.95	144.60	165.26	185.92	227.24	268.55	309.87	371.84
Poynings	155.85	181.82	207.80	233.77	285.72	337.67	389.62	467.54
Pyecombe	186.05	217.05	248.06	279.07	341.09	403.10	465.12	558.14
Slaugham	171.01	199.52	228.02	256.52	313.52	370.53	427.53	513.04
Turners Hill	204.61	238.71	272.81	306.91	375.11	443.31	511.52	613.82
Twineham	160.32	187.04	213.76	240.48	293.92	347.36	400.80	480.96
West Hoathly	174.92	204.07	233.23	262.38	320.69	378.99	437.30	524.76
Worth	162.17	189.19	216.22	243.25	297.31	351.36	405.42	486.50

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at as set out in Table 3 Section 7 of this report 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.

3.3.4 That it be noted that for the year 2022/23, West Sussex County Council have stated the following amounts in precept issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwelling shown below:

Valuation band	£	Valuation band	£
band A	1,037.16	band E	1,901.46
band B	1,210.02	band F	2,247.18
band C	1,382.88	band G	2,592.90
band D	1,555.74	band H	3,111.48

3.3.5 That it be noted that for the year 2022/23 the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner have stated the following amounts in precept issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Valuation band	£	Valuation band	£
band A	149.94	band E	274.89
band B	174.93	band F	324.87
band C	199.92	band G	374.85
band D	224.91	band H	449.82

3.3.6 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts as at 3.3.3(g), 3.3.4 and 3.3.5 above, the Council in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2022/23 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Parish area	band A £	band B £	band C £	band D £	band E £	band F £	band G £	band H £
Albourne	1,339.27	1,562.48	1,785.69	2,008.90	2,455.32	2,901.74	3,348.17	4,017.80
Ansty & Staplefield	1,358.82	1,585.29	1,811.76	2,038.23	2,491.17	2,944.11	3,397.05	4,076.46
Ardingly	1,386.97	1,618.13	1,849.29	2,080.45	2,542.77	3,005.09	3,467.42	4,160.90
Ashurst Wood	1,368.71	1,596.83	1,824.95	2,053.07	2,509.31	2,965.55	3,421.78	4,106.14
Balcombe	1,366.19	1,593.88	1,821.58	2,049.28	2,504.68	2,960.07	3,415.47	4,098.56
Bolney	1,348.76	1,573.55	1,798.35	2,023.14	2,472.73	2,922.31	3,371.90	4,046.28
Burgess Hill	1,357.55	1,583.81	1,810.07	2,036.33	2,488.85	2,941.37	3,393.88	4,072.66
Cuckfield	1,402.86	1,636.67	1,870.48	2,104.29	2,571.91	3,039.53	3,507.15	4,208.58
East Grinstead	1,368.90	1,597.05	1,825.20	2,053.35	2,509.65	2,965.95	3,422.25	4,106.70
Fulking	1,353.56	1,579.15	1,804.75	2,030.34	2,481.53	2,932.71	3,383.90	4,060.68
Hassocks	1,364.81	1,592.27	1,819.74	2,047.21	2,502.15	2,957.08	3,412.02	4,094.42
Haywards Heath	1,346.07	1,570.41	1,794.76	2,019.10	2,467.79	2,916.48	3,365.17	4,038.20
Horsted Keynes	1,360.43	1,587.17	1,813.91	2,040.65	2,494.13	2,947.61	3,401.08	4,081.30
Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common	1,366.07	1,593.74	1,821.42	2,049.10	2,504.46	2,959.81	3,415.17	4,098.20
Lindfield	1,351.34	1,576.56	1,801.79	2,027.01	2,477.46	2,927.90	3,378.35	4,054.02
Lindfield Rural	1,336.87	1,559.68	1,782.49	2,005.30	2,450.92	2,896.54	3,342.17	4,010.60
Newtimber	1,311.05	1,529.55	1,748.06	1,966.57	2,403.59	2,840.60	3,277.62	3,933.14
Poynings	1,342.95	1,566.77	1,790.60	2,014.42	2,462.07	2,909.72	3,357.37	4,028.84
Pyecombe	1,373.15	1,602.00	1,830.86	2,059.72	2,517.44	2,975.15	3,432.87	4,119.44
Slaugham	1,358.11	1,584.47	1,810.82	2,037.17	2,489.87	2,942.58	3,395.28	4,074.34
Turners Hill	1,391.71	1,623.66	1,855.61	2,087.56	2,551.46	3,015.36	3,479.27	4,175.12
Twineham	1,347.42	1,571.99	1,796.56	2,021.13	2,470.27	2,919.41	3,368.55	4,042.26
West Hoathly	1,362.02	1,589.02	1,816.03	2,043.03	2,497.04	2,951.04	3,405.05	4,086.06
Worth	1,349.27	1,574.14	1,799.02	2,023.90	2,473.66	2,923.41	3,373.17	4,047.80

The meeting finished at 9.00 pm

Chairman