



Laverstock & Ford Parish Council

Incorporating Milford, Bishopdown Farm, Old Sarum & Longhedge

Annual Meeting of the Parish Council held on Monday 20th May 2024 at Salisbury Football Club

MINUTES

Councillors present: Baker (Chair), Harris, Jones, Lynn, McDonald, Rigiani, Schneider(until 8.25pm) Waller, Williams

In attendance: Brain (Communications and Community Engagement Officer CCEO), Deane (Clerk), Prince (Responsible Financial Officer RFO)

Also in attendance were Wiltshire Councillors McLennan and Oliver, and 6 members of the public.

The meeting commenced at 8pm.

24.057 Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Cllr Baker confirmed he wished to stand for election of Chair. There were no other candidates.

Resolved: to elect Councillor Nick Baker as Chair of Laverstock and Ford Parish Council

Cllr Jones confirmed she wished to stand for election as Vice-Chair. There were no other candidates.

Resolved: to elect Councillor Jones as Vice-Chair of Laverstock and Ford Parish Council

The Chair and Vice-Chair signed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office.

24.058 Apologies

Apologies had been received from Cllrs Barker and Vanstone.

Resolved: to accept the apologies received.

24.059 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Harris declared a pecuniary interest in item 24.062 20/11598/OUT and will abstain from discussion or vote on that item.

24.060 Approval of Minutes

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15th April 2024

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22nd April 2024

24.061 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

24.062 Planning

20/11598/OUT Land East of Church Road, Laverstock

The Clerk had circulated Report 24.062(1) in advance of the meeting on behalf of Cllr McDonald, setting out the proposed council response to the revised application.

Resolved: to approve the response 'object with reasons' to the revised application. The full response agreed is attached as Annex One.

Planning Log

Resolved: to approve the following responses

PL/2024/01898 Installation of 2 Air Source Heat Pumps at Mill House, Milford Mill Road, Salisbury NO OBJECTION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

PL/2024/02654 Works to 5 Elm Trees, Green Lane, Ford NO OBJECTION

PL/2024/02824 Works to Trees 9 Green Lane, Ford NO COMMENT

PL/2024/04524 Works to Trees 6 The Close, Old Sarum NO COMMENT

24.063 Review of Standing Orders

The Clerk confirmed that no changes were recommended to the current Standing Orders.

Resolved: to re-adopt the Standing Orders unchanged

24.064 Review and approval of amendments to Financial Regulations

The RFO had circulated Report 24.064 in advance of the meeting, detailing proposed amendments to spending limits for Clerk and RFO, requirement for approval of bank mandate, process for amendment

of bank details for suppliers, process for use of debit card and confirmation that cash is not used by the Council.

Resolved: to re-adopt the Financial Regulations as amended.
Full details of amendments are attached as Annex Two

24.065 Review of Current Bank Mandate and Authorising Councillors

The RFO had circulated Report 24.065 in advance of the meeting, setting out the current banking arrangements and named signatories.

Resolved: to approve the mandates at Lloyds Bank and CCLA including the named officers and councillors as set out in Report 24.065.

24.066 Approval of Reserves Policy

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

24.067 Review of Asset Register

The RFO had circulated Report 24.067 in advance of the meeting, with a copy of the current Asset Register detailing total Fixed Assets on 31st March 2024 of £1,496,240. This is an increase of £223,683 on 2022/23.

Resolved: to approve the Asset Register 2023-24

24.068 Review of Financial Risk Assessment

The RFO had circulated Report 24.068 in advance of the meeting setting out the Financial Risk Assessment for the council. Cllr McDonald questioned whether a risk should be included regarding any potential attack on the banking system which would prevent access to PC funds. The RFO will consider how to include this.

Resolved: to accept the Financial Risk Assessment dated 20th May 2024 as circulated as a true statement of the Financial Risks to the council.

Cllr Scheider left the meeting at this point.

24.069 Approval of Insurance

The RFO had circulated Report 24.069 in advance of the meeting with details of the councils insurance policy underwritten by Zurich Municipal. A 5% discount is being offered for a 3 year deal. Alternative insurers have been approached but have failed to respond. The RFO noted that 75% of the premium related to reinstatement costs for the buildings at Old Sarum Community Centre and Hampton Park Pavilion. The Internal Auditor recommended that re-instatement costs were re-assessed every 5 years. The Council agreed that the RFO should instruct re-assessment of Old Sarum Community Centre with Ridge Partners, who were the original surveyors who supervised the construction of the building, noting that this would exceed the budget for professional fees this year.

Resolved: to approve the renewal of insurance with Zurich Municipal through Community First on a 3-year Long Term Agreement.

24.070 Review of Effectiveness of Internal Controls

The RFO had circulated Report 24.070 in advance of the meeting, setting out the processes followed to ensure compliance with Standing Orders and Financial Regulations.

Resolved: that the council confirms it has conducted a review of the effectiveness of the system of internal control required by regulations 3 and 6 of The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.

24.071 Membership of External Organisations

The Clerk reported the councils membership of Wiltshire Association of Local Councils, National Association of Local Councils, Natural England, Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, Community First and that the Clerk and RFO were both members of the Society for Local Council Clerks. This was duly noted.

24.072 Review and approval of amendments to Scheme of Delegation

The Clerk had circulated Report 24.072 in advance of the meeting, detailing proposed changes to the Scheme of Delegation.

Resolved: in accordance with Standing Order 4(d), the council resolves to dissolve the Communications and Community Engagement Committee and Operations Committee and create a Communications and Community Engagement Working Group and Operations Working Group
Resolved: to approve the amended Scheme of Delegation.
The updated Scheme of Delegation is attached as Annex Three.

24.073 Committee membership

Cllr Waller confirmed that she was resigning from the Communications and Community Engagement CCE Working Group, but would stay on the Finance and General Purposes Committee.
Cllr Rigiani agreed to join the Communications and Community Engagement Working Group.
Cllr Barker had agreed to be nominated as Chair of the Communications and Community Engagement Working Group.

Resolved: to appoint Cllr Barker as Chair of the Communications and Community Engagement Working Group, for Cllr Rigiani to join the Communications and Community Engagement Working Group, for Cllr Waller to become a 'non-chair' member of the Finance and General Purposes Committee.

Committee and Working Group Membership will be:

Finance and General Purposes Committee: - Baker (Chair), McDonald (Chair Operations WG), Barker (Chair CCE WG), Schneider, Waller

Operations WG:- McDonald (Chair), Barker, Harris, Lynn, Williams

CCE WG:- Barker(Chair), Jones, Lynn, Rigiani

Personnel Committee: Jones(Chair), Baker, McDonald, Waller

24.074 Internal Audit Report and Comments

The RFO had circulated Report 24.074 in advance of the meeting, with the report and observations from the internal auditor. Most issues had been addressed in the review of Financial Regulations. Councillors discussed the use of s137 powers when awarding grants. The RFO confirmed that fidelity insurance for the Clerk and RFO had been increased to £2Million. Councillors were content that the financial controls were sufficient to manage the risk and maintain the fidelity guarantee at £1Million for all other staff and councillors. The recording of budget figures within Scribe to give better clarity in monitoring expenditure was discussed.

Resolved: that the council acknowledges review of the Observations and Recommendations of the internal auditor and notes the Comments and corrective actions recorded by the Clerk and RFO.

24.075 Approval of Internal Audit Report

The RFO had circulated Report 24.075 in advance of the meeting with the full statement of responses.

Resolved: to approve the Annual Internal Report 2023/24 for inclusion in the Annual Governance and Accountability Return 2023/24..

24.076 Approval of Annual Governance Statements

The RFO had circulated Report 24.076 in advance of the meeting. All Councillors confirmed their agreement to the 8 statements of the Annual Governance Statement.

Resolved: that the council agrees with each of the governance statements and approve the Annual Governance Statement 2023/24.

24.077 Approval of 2023-2024 Accounting Statement

The RFO had circulated Report 24.077 in advance of the meeting. The RFO noted the increase in figures year on year with the expansion of the council.

Resolved: to approve the Accounting Statements 2023/24 as set out in Report 24.077

24.078 Approval of the Notice of the Period for Exercise of Public Rights

The RFO had circulated Report 24.078 in advance of the meeting with a copy of the notice.

Resolved: to approve the Notice of the Period for Exercise of Public Rights dated 21st May 2024. The Period for the Exercise of Public Rights will commence on Monday 3rd June 2024 and end on Friday 12th July 2024. The confirmation of the dates of the notice was signed by the Chair.

The notice is attached at Annex 4.

24.079 Approval of appointment of contractor Whitebridge Play Area

Following independent review of the seven tenders received by a panel of 3 councillors, the Operations Officer had circulated Report 24.079 in advance of the meeting.

Resolved: to appoint Wicksteed Leisure for the refurbishment of Whitebridge play area for a cost of £82,000 + VAT

24.080 Finance

Officers Report

The RFO noted the requirement to report overspend of budgets to the Council.

The RFO reported that we were currently exceeding budgets on professional fees and community buildings. It was expected that some of this would be recouped by a grant application from River Bourne Community Farm, to use their grant funds from the current year to cover the legal fees incurred following the breaches of lease. The work at Laverstock Village Hall to repair the drains had used a significant part of the community buildings budget with further work still required. The Clerk will contact the committee regarding any reserves they may hold and possible insurance cover. The RFO noted that 80% of the annual grant budget had already been awarded for the current year.

The RFO had circulated Report 24.080 in advance of the meeting. Cllr Baker confirmed that he had checked the accounts in detail for the current month.

Adoption of Monthly Accounts for April 2024

The Financial Statements had previously been circulated in Report 24.080. The total funds held on 30th April 2024 were £1,989,875.62 of which £1,699,552.92 were earmarked or restricted reserves.

Resolved: To adopt the monthly accounts as a true record of the Council's finances.

Authorisation of Payments

The lists of payments had been circulated in Report 24.080. Total cheque and BACS payments in May 2024 amounted to £43,903.04, including solicitors fees of £2,064.60 and grants of £12,400. Debit card and direct debit payments in April 2024 amounted to £1,321.15.

Resolved: To approve the cheque, BACS, direct debit and debit card payments.

Review of Reserves and Treasury Deposit Report

Reserves and Treasury Deposit Reports had been presented in Report 24.080.

A total of £1,933,062.97 was held on deposit on 30th April 2024. £350,000 was invested in a new 95-Day Notice account with Lloyds that yielded £691.03 interest. £314,093.09 is on a 32-Day Notice account with Lloyds and yielded £660.08 during April. £1,268,278.85 is invested in the CCLA Public Sector Deposit Fund and earned a dividend of £5,078.73 in April. The dividend was re-invested.

The total Restricted and Earmarked Reserves held at the end of April 2024 were £1,699,552.92. Of these funds £1,268,298.58 are held for long-term maintenance or other specific projects.

Resolved: to note the reserve and treasury deposit reports

24.081 Nomination for Asset of Community Value

The Chair reported on the closure of the Duck Public House in Laverstock, but confirmed that he had received a promising response from the brewery regarding seeking a new tenant. The council did not wish to pursue a nomination at this stage.

24.082 Clerks Report and Correspondence

The Clerk reported that Vistry had refused any possible retention of the Longhedge Sales Office and that it would be demolished. The Clerk confirmed that architects had been consulted regarding possible changes at Hampton Park Pavilion.

24.083 Exempt Business – Exclusion of the Press and Public

Resolved: that in view of the Commercial In Confidence nature of the business about to be transacted, that the public and press be temporarily excluded from the meeting under the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960 and the Local Government Act 1972 s100.

The Chair reported on progress with meetings with River Bourne Community Farm directors.

NEXT MEETING. The next Parish Council Meeting will be held on Monday 15th June 2024 at Old Sarum and Longhedge Community Centre.

SIGNED:

DATE:

ANNEX ONE

LFPC Response to Revised (April 2024) Outline Planning Application 20/11598/OUT - Land to the East of Church Road

Laverstock and Ford Parish Council Objects to the Revised (April 2024) Outline Planning Application 20/11598/OUT for the following reasons:

- The application is premature in relation to the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan and would prejudice the plan making process.
- Contravention of existing and emerging spatial planning policies
- Lack of local needs for housing
- Development 'creep'
- Adverse impacts on landscape sensitivity
- Adverse impacts on vehicular and pedestrian traffic

Prematurity in Relation to the Emerging Local Plan

The application relies heavily in the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan (draft LP), Policy 30, and if the published Local Plan timeline is adhered to the Plan is likely to be submitted to the Secretary of State for inspection before the end of this year. Policy 30 was not publicly consulted on in the previous Regulation 18 consultation and so the Regulation 19 consultation has been the first opportunity for the local population to be consulted and for the policy to be tested in any way. There has been a large number of objections to the policy and, if Wiltshire Council does not choose to withdraw it, it will undoubtedly be tested before the Planning Inspector. To accept this Planning Application based on policy 30 at the current time would prejudice this aspect of the Local Plan making process, and thus the Application is premature.

Contravention of Existing and Emerging Spatial Planning Policies

The covering letter of the Outline PA 20/11598/OUT (PA) seeks to promote the PA as in accord with the draft LP, policy 30 which allocates up to 50 houses to the Church Road site.

The National Planning Policy Framework, 2023 (NPPF) para 48 b states, the Local Planning Authority may give weight to policies in emerging plans according to the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. In this case there is a large number of unresolved objections to Policy 30 including one submitted by the Parish Council based on the advice of a planning barrister. Therefore, at this point in the process Policy 30 should be given less weight than Policy 1 which is itself based upon the established and tested Core Policy 2 from the previous Local Plan.

If the draft LP conditions apply then the PA contravenes policy 1:

- a) Laverstock is identified as a Small Village (draft LP para 4.159)
- b) Small Villages are defined as having (draft LP para 3.14) "a low level of services and facilities" which "may accommodate some very modest development . . ." including "infill."
- c) "Development at Small Villages will be limited to respond to local needs and to contribute to their vitality." (draft LP Policy 1). As set out in the Laverstock and Ford Neighbourhood Plan (NP), local needs are being met from other developments within the Parish.
- d) "At Small Villages, the settlement strategy provides sufficient flexibility for neighbourhood planning groups to meet local housing needs, by a variety of means, at a scale that preserves the character and setting of a village. . . new housing development will be limited to infill within the built-up area of Small Villages or should be geared towards meeting local affordable needs through exception sites, or up to 20 homes, or 5% of the size of the settlement (whichever is the lower)." (draft LP para 4.213)

If the pre-existing planning conditions apply then the PA choice of site and scale of development contravene Core Policies 1 and 2 of the current Wiltshire Council Core Strategy, namely that Laverstock, which is defined as a Small Village, is limited to infill only (generally 1 or 2 new houses in plots between existing dwellings), unless there is a compelling need within the village for development.

Lack of Local Need for Housing

As indicated above, Laverstock is categorised as a Small Village in the draft LP which then describes the constraints on development appertaining to Small Villages. However the draft LP also includes Policy 30 which allocates up to 50 houses to the land east of Church Road, Laverstock, not as an exception site and not in order to meet local needs (which would in any case be limited to 20 houses), but as a 'reasonable alternative' site for the housing needs of Salisbury. The draft LP contains no policy or condition to enable such an option or resolve the contradiction and the Parish Council has robustly challenged the soundness of the draft LP as a result.

The PA makes no case or claim for meeting the housing needs of Salisbury, which would require at the least a

Framework Travel Plan describing sustainable transport links between the site and Salisbury, and the Parish Council rejects totally any claim that this PA is aimed at meeting compelling local needs. The Laverstock and Ford Communities Neighbourhood Plan (NP), Appendix 6 (Assessment of Local Housing Needs) concludes (pp.2,3) “A review of available evidence strongly indicates that the local need for affordable housing in the parish is low in both absolute and relative terms. This need is being addressed by the recent (and continuing) extensive programme of house building within the Parish and the requirement of Wiltshire Council for 40% of units to be in the form of affordable housing.” Even the draft LP Policy 30 did not argue that the policy was intended to meet local needs.

Development ‘Creep’

If the draft LP were to be declared sound notwithstanding its overtly contradictory policies 1 and 30, and the assessments contained within the NP are to be so quickly and easily discounted then the Parish Council is deeply sceptical about the capacity of this PA to limit the development to 49 houses on a 3.11ha site for the foreseeable future. The draft LP, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Annex 2.11 relating to SA Objective 8 (Conserve and enhance the character and quality of rural and urban landscapes) shares this concern: “Potential for development to result in expansion of Laverstock to the east of Church Road that would alter the rural character and sense of separation from the hillside of Cockey Down.”

The initial (2020) application envisaged 135 houses on a 3.6ha footprint within an overall site of 7.91ha and there is no indication in the revised PA that such a target is not the ultimate ambition of the developer. Once up to 49 houses are allocated and built, many of the arguments around landscape sensitivity, Small Village and ‘semi-rural’ are weakened while arguments around meeting housing density targets in line with local planning policy become stronger, thereby making applications for further development harder to resist and reject. In the absence of safeguards limiting further development on and adjacent to the site, the Parish Council concludes that this Outline PA is, in effect, a “Trojan Horse”: development ‘creep’ becomes inevitable.

Adverse Impacts on Landscape Sensitivity

The NP includes a Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (LSA) which identifies the land at Church Road as of medium to high visual sensitivity, adjoining land of high sensitivity.

Regarding potential development on the Church Road site, the LSA comments:

“Large scale development in any of these areas is not recommended, but individual or small developments where there is local enclosure through topography or vegetation may be possible. Any development along Church Road should be in a series of clusters to allow the views of the Downs beyond to still be viewed between any houses, in a similar way to the closes on the other side of the road which allow views of the River Bourne. In this way, visual connections will be maintained across this landscape.”

The Outline PA misleadingly suggests in its Parameters Plan that the large development of up to 49 houses in two clusters reflects “recommendations” of the LSA in the NP. The Parameters Plan states:

- “Development forms two clusters of development in accordance with the recommendations in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment for Laverstock and Ford Parish, Wiltshire – (Landshape 23 June 2020)”; and
- “Green space between development clusters maintains the ‘visual gap’ described in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment for Laverstock and Ford Parish, Wiltshire and allows views through development towards Cockey Down.”

The LSA actually states the opposite, “Large scale development in any of these areas is NOT RECOMMENDED”. The LSA goes on to state, “individual or small developments where there is local enclosure through topography or vegetation may be possible.” Firstly the LSA states “may” not “will” be possible. Any development on such sites is predicated on local need, and the section above has already argued there is none. Secondly, the LSA states that any such permitted development needs to be constrained to “individual or small”.

In relation to the land east of Church Road the LSA gives an illustration of the size and layout of any individual or small development which should apply where local need has dictated that development is necessary, notwithstanding the general recommendation that development on the site is not recommended. The LSA states, “Any development along Church Road should be in a series of clusters to allow the views of the Downs beyond to still be viewed between any houses, in a similar way to the closes on the other side of the road which allow views of the River Bourne.”

The closes referred to are two in number, each consisting of only of four houses: two facing pairs along a short drive so that the narrowest elevation of each house faces Church Road, thus minimizing the visual obstruction of the River Bourne and its water meadows. The PA is for up to 49 houses in two clusters with a central gap containing, according

to the Parameters Plan, a “Centrally located and accessible play area.” The proposed gap is less than one third the existing frontage of the Church Road site. The visual connection with the landscape is thus reduced from a panorama to a doorway flanked by urban development and the foreground “visual gap” is described in terms indistinguishable from any urban green space and play area which is a far cry from the NP in terms of scale and layout, and effectively invalidates any description of Laverstock as ‘semi-rural’.

That Laverstock is a Small Village and ‘semi-rural’ is one of the reasons people are attracted to the area. It is not urban or suburban or even semi-urban but semi-rural, encouraging the natural surroundings to break into the built environment. As Gallent et al* observe, “The fringe is often viewed as periurban but as being strongly influenced by urban pressure and process. But there is an alternative view: that the fringe is perirural and within the rural rather than within the urban.”

** Planning on the Edge: England’s Rural-Urban Fringe and Spatial Planning Agenda: Gallent N, Bianconi M, Andersson J; May 2006 Environmental and Planning B Planning and Design; 33(3):457-476*

The SAs relevant to the draft LP policy 30, proposing the allocation of up to 50 houses on this site, are equally relevant to this PA.

SA Objective 8 considers the site to be a “locally valued landscape,” and the feedback we have received as a Parish Council since the draft LP was published shows the significance very many local residents attach to this landscape and the role this site plays in connecting the village into its rural setting. The road frontage at this point on Church Road is not only valued but is the only unobstructed window onto the Downs now available for people entering the village from the North (and for residents of Salisbury City living on elevated ground to the West). It is, in the words of the draft LP, Sites Landscape Appraisals, a “quintessential view” and the feedback would indicate that this vista has therapeutic, aesthetic, environmental and symbolic significance for residents, embodying the key features of the “semi-rural” village. The Parish Council considers the PA allocation of up to 49 houses to the space will obstruct and adversely restrict the window and render the experience of those travelling southwards along Church Road little different from any urban environment with parks, green spaces and mere glimpses of distant views. The PA would not therefore “conserve and enhance the character and quality of rural and urban landscapes, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.” Nor would it, “maintain the character of the landscape when viewed from both inside and outside the Parish” in accordance with NP Policy 2. This adverse impact would be compounded by the further urbanization of the village from any physical expansion of the schools on Church Road required to accommodate the number of pupils generated by the development.

SA Annex 2.11 relating to SA Objective 1 (Preservation and enhancement of biodiversity etc.) includes the following statements:

- “Residential development at the site, in close proximity to the river would potentially lead to an increase in recreational / visitor pressure which could give rise to adverse effects on the river and its associated riparian habitat, as well as upon the species it supports. A mitigation strategy will be required to address impacts on the River Avon SAC.”
- “Cockey Down SSSI and Cockey Down Chalk CWS lies to the immediate east of the proposed allocation site and could be subject to adverse effects during construction as well as during operation. A public right of way runs through both the SSSI and CWS meaning development at the proposed allocation site would be likely lead to an increase in visitor / recreational pressure and a deterioration of the sites over time.”
- “Laverstock Down CWS lies 370m south-east of the site. This CWS is contiguous with Cockey Down Chalk CWS and would also likely be subject to additional visitor / recreational pressure as a result of development at this site. There are several other SSSIs and CWSs within a short distance of the proposed allocation site that are accessible either on foot or via a short car journey, and which could also suffer increased visitor / recreational pressure as a result of development at this site.”
- “... It’s unlikely to be possible to completely deter additional visits to the designated site by residents of a development at the proposed allocation site and therefore, that the potential for adverse effects could not be entirely offset.”
- “Overall a moderate adverse effect is considered likely against this objective.”

SA Objective 2 (Ensure efficient and effective use of land and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings), adds:

- “Development of this site would lead to a significant, permanent loss of Grade 3 agricultural land.”

The SA concedes that the potential for adverse effects could not be entirely offset. The Parish Council takes the view that no mitigation strategies will be sufficiently robust to constrain the adverse effects to “moderate” regarding the objective of protecting and enhancing biodiversity on this site or compliance with the mitigation strategy for the New

Forest protected sites.

SA Annex 2.11 relating to SA Objective 8 (Conserve and enhance the character and quality of rural and urban landscapes) includes the following statements:

- Potential for built form to be intrusive in the rural landscape setting and alter the character of the distinctive views of Salisbury on the approach from the northeast.
- Potential for built form to be conspicuous on the rising slopes that form the rural backdrop and context to the existing settlement of Laverstock and northeast of Salisbury.
- Potential for development to result in expansion of Laverstock to the east of Church Road that would alter the rural character and sense of separation from the hillside of Cockey Down.
- Potential for inappropriate screening planting that would be uncharacteristic in the landscape.
- Potential change from a rural to urban context for visitors to Cockey Down nature reserve.
- Potential loss of hedgerow boundaries, shrubs, trees and woodland that contribute to green links through the local landscape to link river valley vegetation and woodland in the wider context. “

The Parish Council considers the PA fails to provide sufficient and relevant evidence of the magnitude to which its proposed mitigating measures will realistically offset (and the extent to which they will not offset) the ‘moderate adverse effect’ identified in the draft LP. The fact that the supporting landscape assessment does not even refer to the made NP for the area indicates that the applicants have failed to have regard for the plan.

Adverse Impacts on Vehicular and Pedestrian Traffic

One of the most frequent concerns that local residents have raised to us about the site is the impact of development on the existing traffic problems that are experienced on the road at the start and end of the school day. These are identified in section 7.1.2 of the NP and photographic examples are provided in Appendix 1. Church Road is insufficiently wide to allow traffic to flow in both directions around parked cars and this is the cause of significant congestion, pollution and incidences of dangerous driving at the start and end of the school day. As there is not scope for discrete right turn lanes for East bound traffic into the two entrances to this development this site could potentially add significantly to these problems as traffic queues for an opportunity to turn right into any new development on the site. These issues do not appear to have been considered in the sustainability assessment or elsewhere.

The draft LP, SA objective 11 (Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices) quotes Paragraph 73 of the NPPF (para 74 (b) of the revised 2023 NPPF), which states:

‘that when planning for larger scale development, authorities should “ensure that their size and location will support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself.” Similarly, paragraph 105 of the NPPF (109 2023 NPPF) provides that “Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.”’

There are clearly no services and employment opportunities included in the PA within the development itself, and NP, Appendix 6 (Assessment of Local Housing Needs) concludes (pp.2,3) “A review of available evidence strongly indicates that the local need for affordable housing in the parish is low in both absolute and relative terms.” It is therefore reasonable to expect new residents to travel for services and employment opportunities. The site is at a distance from retail and employment opportunities in Salisbury City Centre, the A36 Southampton Road Retail Park, The A30 London Road and scientific and military establishments to the North of Laverstock. The draft LP also indicates that school age residents may have to travel for education.

Transport Assessment

The Parish Council considers the PA Transport Assessment (TA) to be substantially flawed and fails to accurately assess the adverse impact of the development on significantly increased private car use. Furthermore, the Parish Council considers the TA to be misleading in its assessment of the impact of the development on local traffic.

The Manual Traffic Surveys (TA Part 3), include the period of school drop-off by covering the period 0730 to 0930 but exclude the school pick-up time, covering only 1630 to 1830. The omission results in conclusions skewed in favour of sustainability and is far from accurate.

The Highway Network considered in TA Part 2 (Fig 4.8) includes the junction of Church Road with the A30 to the north and with the A36 to the south but excludes the junction with the A36 Southampton Road at Petersfinger, accessed via Manor Farm Road and Milford Mill Road.

Milford Mill Road, compared with its alternatives, provides a shorter distance and faster travel time between Laverstock and the A36 Southampton Road and gives access to a substantial range of employment and retail

opportunities as well as a faster route to the New Forest and Southampton. Because of traffic congestion in Salisbury, the road is a major 'rat-run' for Salisbury traffic in both directions. It is narrow; contains two 'pinch points' (the medieval bridge, and the railway arch at Petersfinger); suffers from irregular, potholed edges; is prone to regular flooding throughout the year from frequent run-off and occasional overflows of the River Bourne; and is subject to a 20mph speed limit.

Flooding is an intractable problem on Milford Mill Road: a Wiltshire Council written response to pre-submitted questions from the Parish Council for a 'Highways Matters' event on 22 February 2024, stated, "The land surrounding Milford Mill Road forms part of the flood plain. The surface level of the carriageway is very little different to that of the surrounding land and as such is prone to flooding. There is a proposed scheme to improve the way that water discharges from our drainage system to the river. While this will make a positive impact on flooding, it will not prevent floods from occurring."

Use of the road as an access route to and from the Church Road site receives no mention, and certainly no impact assessment. The Parish Council consider this to be a substantial and major omission from the TA for the site and considers the road is most unsuitable for the increased weight of traffic generated by up to 49 additional houses on Church Road.

NPPF (2023) paragraph 115 states, "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe."

The Parish Council considers Milford Mill Road most unsuitable to absorb the impact from up to 49 houses on the proposed site. Furthermore, it considers the cumulative impacts on Milford Mill Road and the historic medieval bridge will indeed be severe from the proposed site when combined with the following Planning Applications under consultation:

- PL/2023/10495 (Conversion of Elmfield House and outbuildings to 6 x dwellings and the erection of 15 dwellings);
- PL/01200/FUL (Erect 19 no. new houses to create a new retirement estate and community, incorporating existing scheme of 4no. dwellings), both at Petersfinger; and
- PL/2023/07368, Old Sarum Airfield (allocating 155 houses at Ford).

Access between the A36 Southampton Road and the A30/A338 (including the village of Ford), and access between the A36 Southampton Road and the schools on Church Road, has historically strongly favoured the 'rat-run' along Milford Mill Road, Manor Farm Road, and Laverstock Road over the A36 Southampton Road - Churchill Way - A30 London Road (or Wain-a-long Road, Laverstock Road). A Transport Assessment for the addition of, potentially, 245 houses across four sites cannot be done piecemeal except on a 'first come, first served' basis which would place an unrealistic burden on individual developers to revise their TA in the light of each emerging, newly granted planning permission. The TA for the Church Road site contains no assessment of the site in the context of a wider set of site developments, which, in our opinion, renders its conclusions and mitigating factors valueless. The Parish Council considers a Transport Assessment for the Laverstock local road network must be considered in its entirety. Sadly, this is an omission in the draft LP.

The TA Part 1 Figure 4.2 illustrates walking isochrones for 800m and 2k, measured from the centre of the (initial) site. The Parish Council acknowledges that TAs tend to follow generic models, accepted by planning officers. Nonetheless in small villages, the impact from and on unique local conditions can have a critical effect on individual behaviours which is not reflected in the model.

Even at a generic level of modelling, the impacts could be more accurately estimated. The Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation has published guidance (*Planning for Walking 2015*) which states that about 80 per cent of journeys shorter than 1 mile are made wholly on foot. For journeys that are 1 to 2 miles long, 26 per cent are made on foot. Applying such multipliers to the 800m (0.5mile) and 2k (1.24 miles) isochrones offers a more accurate model of the number of potential journeys on foot, which would correspondingly increase the potential vehicular traffic impact.

The Site Accessibility Audit references in support of its modelling the IHT document (*'Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot 2000'*) but omits the factors impacting acceptable walking distances contained in the Guidelines. The IHT Guidelines note that walking distances are impacted by factors such as age, ability, encumbrances (shopping, pushchairs), journey purpose, time savings, convenience, personal motivation. The TA omits any demographic modelling / assumptions of potential residents and potential impact on walking journeys.

The village of Laverstock is unique for its size in having four schools (Primary and Secondary) on Church Road within some 800m of the proposed development and so are within accessible walking distance. The TA paragraph 4.3.7 states that the 800m and 2km walking isochrones from the site, “roughly equate to a 10-minute and 25-minute walk respectively.” However, the presence of the schools and the impact of pedestrian numbers and vehicles at school drop-off and pick-up times present a significant hindrance and disincentive to walking (see Appendix 1 below): lengthening walking times and increasing the hazards to pedestrian safety, especially for those with pushchairs and those with mobility or sight/hearing restrictions. The Audit fails to model or acknowledge the impact of school drop-off and pick-up times on the walking speed and/or motivation of site residents to walk and thus on the level of car use at such times.

The TA also attempts no assessment of demand for school places and the capacity of local schools to meet demand. The draft LP, SA objective 10, acknowledges that the local primary school is most likely not capable of meeting the need for the estimated number of early years and primary school places generated by a development of up to 50 houses. Such pupils will therefore be travelling further, “This would most likely be Salisbury primary schools.” The draft LP, “Planning for Salisbury” (PFS) p.33 states that meeting the demand for secondary school places generated by the site is dependent on increased capacity on the opposite side of the city, “Sufficiency of secondary school places is dependent upon the timely extension of Sarum Academy (developer contributions).” Based on the draft LP SA data, the site is therefore not sustainable in terms of reducing the need to travel and reducing the need to travel by car in order to access local education.

Primary healthcare is of concern nationally and is reflected locally, particularly, access to GPs and access to NHS dental provision. The draft LP, SA Objective 10, states: “The site is situated approx. 1.1km from Bishopdown Surgery. GP provision in Salisbury was forecast as being subject to a positive capacity gap by 2026, however the closure of one branch surgery in 2020 to relocate services has led to issues. Negative premises capacity gaps are therefore apparent within the primary care network. There is a planned extension to the hospital. Expanded services are to be offered by Porton and Winterslow branch surgeries following this the closure of the Wilton branch. As a result, . . . there may be some negative effects on the capacity of individual surgeries. The location and constrained capacity of local surgeries inevitably requires journeys by car or by long and unreliable public transport.”

The history of the Old Sarum and Bishopdown Farm developments gives clear evidence that health provision cannot be attracted out to the edges. While the NHS nationally is seeking to invest in expanded provision, it will take time to realise any benefits and the BMA points out that the supply side of the equation will be a limiting factor for the foreseeable future. The site is therefore not sustainable in terms of access to primary healthcare provision reducing the need to travel and reducing the need to travel by car, whatever the theoretical modelling may suggest.

On the accessibility to other amenities by walking or cycling, the draft LP, SA objective 11 states: “Other than education facilities, Laverstock does not adequately serve its community, leaving long distance walking trips to non-education amenities and employment.

“Cycling is simply accommodated by on carriageway non-compulsory cycle lane facilities and whilst this does represent informal cycle infrastructure provision, such interventions are no longer supported by technical guidance. Furthermore, the on-carriageway cycle lanes only extend along Church Road and terminate at the railway bridge on Laverstock Road to the south and prior to the A30 roundabout in the north. The cycle facilities may therefore only serve cycle accessibility for Laverstock residents and their trips to local schools within Laverstock.”

The local bus services within 1k of the site provide no direct routes to Salisbury station and connections with most locations in and around the city are via the centre of Salisbury. The service has been experienced as problematic, with cancellations, delays and staff shortages in the past, serving to lengthen journey times and discouraging those with access to private transport from opting for public transport. Public transport is also more challenging for those accompanying young children, those with mobility issues, or those wishing to undertake family shopping. The lack of convenient access to local amenities and employment serves to emphasise social inequalities.

APPENDIX 1



ANNEX TWO

From Report 24.064 Amendments to Financial Regulations.
New and amended Regulations are reproduced in full below.
Change to payment limit for the Clerk and RFO.

1.14. In addition, the council must:

- determine and keep under regular review the bank mandate for all council bank accounts,
- approve any grant or a single commitment over £5,000; and
- in respect of the annual salary for any employee have regard to recommendations about annual salaries of employees made by the Personnel Committee in accordance with its terms of reference.

Approval of Bank Mandate by Full Council.

6.12. Where internet banking arrangements are made with any bank, the Clerk and RFO shall be jointly appointed as Service Administrators. The bank mandate approved by the council shall identify at least four councillors, usually members of the Finance and General Purposes Committee, who will be authorised to approve transactions on those accounts in accordance with 6.4. When any changes are made to the mandate they shall be approved by full council.

Changes to account details of suppliers.

6.13. Changes to account details for suppliers, which are used for internet banking may only be changed on written hard copy notification by the supplier and supported by a hard copy authority for change signed by the Clerk or RFO and one member.

Use of Debit Card.

6.14. A Debit Card will be issued for the use of the Clerk and RFO. The Debit Cards are restricted to a single transaction maximum value of £1,000 unless authorised by the council or the Finance and General Purposes committee before any order is placed. All purchases on a Debit Card shall be retrospectively approved by the council.

Use of Cash.

6.15. The council will not maintain any form of cash float and will not accept cash as a form of payment.

Laverstock & Ford Parish Council Scheme of Delegations

Date last amended
Date adopted
Minute Reference
Date of next review

1. Subject to the matters reserved to the full Parish Council, **Standing Committees** are delegated with the powers and duties described below.
2. **Advisory Committees** which may be established from time to time, may consider matters within their remit and make recommendations to Council but may not take decisions in their own right. All Standing Committees and Advisory Committees will operate under Council Standing Orders and be accessible to the public. All members may attend all committees if they wish but may only vote at committees of which they have been designated a member. All members are entitled to be a designated member of at least one committee.
3. **Working groups** (sub groups) may be established from time to time to work on specific projects or issues and may include non-members of the Council. Working Groups will not take decisions in their own right but report to a standing committee or to the Parish Council which will take appropriate decisions within their remit. Working Groups are informal and do not operate under standing orders. Councillors are however bound by the Code of Conduct when working on behalf of the Council in all fora whether full Council Committee or Working Group.
4. **The Parish Clerk** is delegated with the powers and duties identified subject to a subsequent report of actions taken to the Parish Council or to the appropriate standing committee.

1. PARISH COUNCIL Meets Monthly

- 1.1. Chair –elected at the annual Parish Council Meeting
- 1.2. Members- All Councillors,
- 1.3. Administration Parish Clerk and/or Deputy Parish Clerk
- 1.4. Attending Parish Clerk, Deputy Parish Clerk and other staff as required.
- 1.5. Considers all matters reserved as outlined below plus recommendations from committees and individual councillor motions.

Matters reserved within Standing Orders.

- 1.5.1. Any special or general directions which the Parish Council may give from time to time.
- 1.5.2. Any relevant statutory provisions not mentioned below.
- 1.5.3. The following specific matters shall also be determined by the Full Council.
 - 1.5.3.1. Adoption of the Council’s Strategic Plan and approval of the implementation programme.
 - 1.5.3.2. Powers reserved in respect of the Council’s Finances including: -

- Final adoption of the forward plan and the annual budget of the Council and the precepts on Wiltshire Council.
 - Schemes involving capital expenditure, outside that which has already been approved in the annual budget. When a scheme has been approved and the estimated cost agreed by the Full Council the appropriate Committee may proceed with it subject to any tender accepted not exceeding the approved estimate.
 - Approval of the Parish Council's annual return and receipt of its audit reports.
 - Determine applications for grants subject to all applications being considered on their merits and in accordance with the agreed grants process.
- 1.5.3.3. To review Parish Council Policies, Procedures and Processes and ensure that they are up to date, fit for purpose, consistent and appropriate
- 1.5.3.4. To determine all personnel policy matters, except any that may be delegated to the Personnel Sub Committee and personnel matters delegated directly by Full Council to the Parish Clerk
- 1.5.3.5. To determine Parish Council planning policy and the response to planning applications except decisions delegated to the Parish Clerk in consultation with members of the appropriate ward.
- 1.5.3.6. The disposal of any freehold land (other than minor adjustments of boundaries).
- 1.5.3.7. The granting or taking of a Leasehold interest in any land.
- 1.5.3.8. The appointment of Committees and representatives on outside bodies.
- 1.5.3.9. The appointment of a Parish Clerk
- 1.5.3.10. The revision of any scale of charges for any service.
- 1.5.3.11. The making of byelaws.
- 1.5.3.12. Any matter of major policy or of sufficient interest or novelty that any three members request that it be debated by Full Council through a motion raised in accordance with standing orders.
- 1.5.4. The Council will receive minutes/reports from standing Committees at the first appropriate meeting following the committee. Reports will be taken as read unless members identify matters for debate.
- 1.5.5. The Council will receive a report from the Parish Clerk at each meeting. Reports will be taken as read unless members identify matters for debate.

STANDING COMMITTEES

2. Finance and General Purposes Committee.

Standing Committee with day to day responsibility for overseeing the Council's finances, and swift implementation of any projects delegated by the full council. Meets monthly two weeks before Full Council and otherwise as required.

- **Chair – Chair of the Council**
 - **Members-**
 - **Chair of the Council**
 - **Chair of Operations Working Group**
 - **Chair of Communications and Community Engagement Working Group**
 - **Two other council members**
- **Attending- Parish Clerk/RFO**

- **Administration -Deputy Parish Clerk**

- 2.1. Day to day oversight of the Parish Council's Finances within the established budget.
- 2.2. Considers reports on financial matters presented by the RFO.
- 2.3. Undertakes a periodic review of financial Risk assessment and insurances.
- 2.4. Oversees Budget preparation for final approval by the Council.
- 2.5. Oversees preparation of the annual return before final approval by the council
- 2.6. Receives and oversees the response to internal and external audits
- 2.7. Undertakes initial action on council responsibilities designated within Financial Regulations and not reserved to the full council or delegated to another committee.
- 2.8. Review of Overall Financial Performance. Makes recommendations for improvements to full council.
- 2.9. Management of any project or programme specifically delegated to it by the Parish Council.
- 2.10. Institute, defend or settle any judicial or quasi-judicial proceedings on behalf of the council and engage legal representatives as required.
- 2.11. Submits Minutes/Reports to the Full Council

3. **Personnel Committee**

Standing committee with delegated authority for personnel matters not otherwise delegated to the Clerk.

Meets as required but not less than 2 times a year.

- **Chair – Appointed by the Council at the Annual Parish Council Meeting not being a chair of any other committee**
- **Members- Chair of the Council**
- **Two other council members**
- **Administration- Parish Clerk**

- 3.1. Forms a panel for any recruitment of the Parish Clerk.
- 3.2. Conducting the Parish Clerk's annual performance appraisal. (minimum of 3 members)
- 3.3. Receives reports from the Clerk on staff appraisals.
- 3.4. Holds meetings as required with the Parish Clerk to discuss any issues or concerns and report to the Parish Council.
- 3.5. Consider any grievances raised by the Parish Clerk.
- 3.6. To appoint, if necessary, a suitably qualified professional to conduct the investigations and/or hearing in the event that disciplinary action needs to be taken against the Parish Clerk.
- 3.7. Considers appeals in staff grievance and disciplinary matters following action by the Clerk.
- 3.8. Authority to dismiss staff failing to satisfactorily complete a probation period.
- 3.9. To settle disciplinary matters in accordance with the agreed Disciplinary Policy.
- 3.10. To receive any grievances against the Parish Clerk.
- 3.11. To authorise, if necessary, an independent professional to conduct any investigations as a result of a grievance or appeal.
- 3.12. To authorise commencement of any action or appeal before an industrial tribunal or in any court.
- 3.13. Consider any other matters delegated to it by the Parish Council
- 3.14. Oversee the development and implementation of employment policies subject to approval by the full council
- 3.15. Submits Minutes/Reports to the Full Council

WORKING GROUPS – Terms of Reference

4. Operations Working Group.

Working group focusing on projects and improvements for Council Property, Outdoor Services Play and Leisure provision.

Meets as required usually 4 times a year

Chair – Appointed by the Council at the Annual Parish Council Meeting not being a Chair of any other committee or Working Group

Members -Not less than three members appointed by the Council at the Annual Parish Meeting, plus non-members as agreed by the council.

Attending- Parish Clerk and Deputy Parish Clerk as required

Staffing – Operations Officer

- 4.1. Recommend to the Parish Council the strategic priorities for all outdoor services.
- 4.2. Consider reports by Operations Officer relating to the ongoing operation of the outdoor services.
- 4.3. Consider all matters relating to definition and implementation of the Parish Council's Environmental Strategy and make recommendations to council.
- 4.4. Oversight of Management all Council Property.
- 4.5. Oversight of Management of all Parish Council recreational and leisure facilities.
- 4.6. Oversight of Provision, siting and maintenance of bins, bus shelters and benches.
- 4.7. Oversight of service level agreements with other bodies on operational matters.
- 4.8. Oversight of any project or programme at the request of the Parish Council.
- 4.9. Consideration of any other matters at the request of the Parish Council.
- 4.10. Submits reports and recommendations to the Full Council.

5. Communications and Community Engagement Working Group

Working Group focusing on Council Marketing, brand management, public relations, interaction and communication with the community and co-ordination of Council events

Meets as required usually 4 times a year

Chair – Appointed by the Council at the Annual Parish Council Meeting not being a Chair of any other committee or Working Group

Members -Not less than three members appointed by the Council at the Annual Parish Meeting, plus non-members as agreed by the council.

Attending- Parish Clerk and Deputy Parish Clerk as required

Staffing – Communications and Community Engagement Officer

- 5.1. Oversight, development and review of the Council's branding, communications and media programme
- 5.2. Oversight of Council communications media including social media, Council website, Newsletter and noticeboards.
- 5.3. Ensure consistent branding on signage at all Council property
- 5.4. Oversight, development and review of the Council's media relations activity, process for responding to events and for briefing the news media of Council policies and programmes.
- 5.5. Oversight, development and review of the Council's community engagement programme

- 5.6. Act as focal point for the management of Community events staged by the Parish Council
- 5.7. Oversee the development of the Council's Annual report.
- 5.8. Oversight of any project, programme or other matter at the request of the Parish Council.

PARISH CLERK

6. The following matters are delegated to the Parish Clerk.
 - 6.1. Acting as Proper Officer as defined by Standing Orders.
 - 6.2. Day to day management of the Parish Council and its resources subject to committee and council oversight.
 - 6.3. Signs all official correspondence arising from resolutions of the Council. Receives all correspondence addressed to the council.
 - 6.4. General personnel management of Parish Council employees in accordance with Council policy, including appraisal, training and first stage in discipline and grievance procedures.
 - 6.5. Carrying out expenditure within the delegated spending limits specified within the financial regulations,
 - 6.6. Discretion to agree up to five days special leave with pay in any one year for compassionate or other grounds i.e. bereavement, family illness, (compassionate leave in excess of five days up to ten days is subject to approval of the Personnel Sub Committee).
 - 6.7. Determination of the Council's response, in conjunction with ward members of any routine planning applications. Ensuring that all significant planning matters are brought to the attention of the full council.
 - 6.8. Parish Clerk has reasonable discretion on a day to day basis to interpret Council policy to achieve reasonable outcomes providing that action taken shall in all cases be reported to the next appropriate meeting of the Full Council. Also where possible or appropriate committee chairs and/or the council chair will be consulted.

RESPONSIBLE FINANCIAL OFFICER

7. The following matters are delegated to the Responsible Financial Officer.
 - 7.1. Undertakes all duties designated to the RFO within financial regulations.
 - 7.2. Carrying out expenditure within the delegated spending limits specified within the financial regulations
 - 7.3. To deputise for the Parish Clerk in all matters in the event of their absence

8. Urgent Business

In all cases where urgent decisions are required and unless otherwise provided, the Parish Clerk shall, from time to time, after consulting the Chair of the relevant Committee concerned (or, in his/her absence, the Vice Chair of the Committee); or the Chair of the Council (or, in their absence, the Vice Chair) and where appropriate the Ward Members, take all necessary steps for protecting the interests of, or advancing the business of the Parish Council, providing that action taken shall in all cases be reported to the next appropriate meeting of the Full Council.

7 General Policy

- 7.1 The minimum number of members to which any action shall be delegated is three.
- 7.2 The Parish Council may appoint members or officers to attend a meeting, or meetings, of another local authority or body as a representative of the Parish Council. He/she shall be

- formally appointed by the Council as its representative.
- 7.3 Any member or officer appointed by the Parish Council to attend a meeting of another authority or body shall represent the views of the Parish Council at that meeting unless they make it clear that the views expressed are their own and not necessarily representative of the Parish Council
 - 7.4 Unless formally appointed as a council spokesperson, no member or officer shall make statements to any news media purporting to represent the views of the Parish Council. Otherwise members and officers should at all times make it clear that any views expressed are their own and not necessarily representative of the Parish Council.
 - 7.5 Where appropriate, reports to Committees and the Parish Council should include a Parish Clerk's recommendation.
 - 7.6 All reports to Committees or Parish Council should indicate the resource and financial implications of the matter and if there are no financial implications that should also be stated.
 - 7.7 The Clerk will maintain and report to council not less than each quarter, a record of all resolutions taken by the council and progress made towards implementation.

Reviewed 20th May 2024

LAVERSTOCK & FORD PARISH COUNCIL

NOTICE OF PUBLIC RIGHTS AND PUBLICATION OF UNAUDITED ANNUAL GOVERNANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY RETURN

ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2024

Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 Sections 26 and 27
The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 (SI 2015/234)

NOTICE

1. Date of announcement: **21st May 2024**

2. Each year the smaller authority's Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR) needs to be reviewed by an external auditor appointed by Smaller Authorities' Audit Appointments Ltd. The unaudited AGAR has been published with this notice. As it has yet to be reviewed by the appointed auditor, it is subject to change as a result of that review.

Any person interested has the right to inspect and make copies of the accounting records for the financial year to which the audit relates and all books, deeds, contracts, bills, vouchers, receipts and other documents relating to those records must be made available for inspection by any person interested. For the year ended 31 March 2024, these documents will be available on reasonable notice by application to:

**Andrew Prince, Responsible Finance Officer,
3 Pilgrims Way, Laverstock, 07900 580986,
andrewprince@laverstock-ford.co.uk.**

commencing on **Monday 3rd June 2024**

and ending on **Friday 12th July 2024**

3. Local government electors and their representatives also have:

- The opportunity to question the appointed auditor about the accounting records; and
- The right to make an objection which concerns a matter in respect of which the appointed auditor could either make a public interest report or apply to the court for a declaration that an item of account is unlawful. Written notice of an objection must first be given to the auditor and a copy sent to the smaller authority.

The appointed auditor can be contacted at the address in paragraph 4 below for this purpose between the above dates only.

4. The smaller authority's AGAR is subject to review by the appointed auditor under the provisions of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014, the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 and the NAO's Code of Audit Practice 2015. The appointed auditor is:

PKF Littlejohn LLP (Ref: SBA Team)
1 Westferry Circus
Canary Wharf
London E14 4HD
(sba@pkf-littlejohn.com)

5. This announcement is made by **Andrew Prince, RFO**