



Slinfold Parish Council

Cherrytree Farm, Hayes Lane, RH13 0SQ

Telephone 07894 858048 email: clerk@slinfold-pc.gov.uk

Minutes of the Slinfold Parish Council Meeting 31st July 2025

1. Attendance and Apologies for Absence

In attendance: Councillors Casdagli, Pyle, Roberts (Chair), Sherwin-Smith, Skeates, Slipper, Nigel Smith and Walker.

Apologies: Councillor Paula Smith which Councillors **RESOLVED** to accept.

Also in attendance: Mike Simpson (Clerk), District Councillor Tricia Youtan and one member of the public.

2. Declarations of Interest, Notification of Changes to Members' Interests and consider any requests for a dispensation.

There were none.

3. Public Session (Members of the Public may speak for up to five minutes at the discretion of the Chair

A member of the public spoke about the amended Meadowhurst application DC/25/0196 and said the barn had been moved around but the size had not changed so it was still too large for the location and storing hay. She also said there was no information on drainage. The Chair thanked her for her comments and said the Council would address it under item 8(b) as it had only received the consultation notification that day.

4. Minutes from the previous meeting on 26th June 2025

Councillors **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes as a true and accurate record.

5. Councillor Reports

To receive reports from the District and County Councillors

County Councillor Christian Mitchell sent his apologies. District Councillor Kasia Greenwood sent her apologies but circulated a written report before the meeting (see appendices). District Councillor Youtan advised that any transfer of Scout hut land from the District to Parish Council must be done before a unitary authority is formed. The Clerk said he would write to HDC about the timeline. The BT exchange building was also raised as a possible asset to transfer and the Clerk said he would write to clarify the position as well. Councillor Youtan also believed developers were interested in land at the chicken farm.

6. Chair's Announcements

There were none.

7. Planning Applications

(a) To consider the following applications

DC/25/0974 Whitebreads Farm Stane Street Slinfold West Sussex: Variation of Condition 4 of previously approved application DC/22/1841 (Extension to hardstanding area and change of use of land for storage of scaffolding (Retrospective)) to allow rack storage to not exceed a total height of 5.5m

Councillors **RESOLVED** to have no objection.

DC/25/0892 Lower Lodge Cottage The Haven Billingshurst West Sussex: Erection of a three-bay detached garage/carport. Erection of a link extension to the main house from existing garage. Installation of 2No. north facing dormers with associated internal alterations.

Councillors **RESOLVED** to have no objection.

DC/25/1001 Fairfield Stud Guildford Road Broadbridge Heath West Sussex: Erection of 3 no dwellinghouses with associated landscaping and parking.

Councillors **RESOLVED** to object to this application as it was outside of the Built Up Area Boundary and not a sustainable location. Furthermore, it was not a brownfield site and not an allocated site within the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan.

**(b) To consider any applications received since the publication of the agenda
DC/25/0196 (Amendment)**

It was **RESOLVED** to object on the same grounds as the previous application that the mass, bulk and size of this building was out of character and appearance with this rural setting. As a result, it would be contrary to Policies 25, 32 and 33 of the HDPF as it would not sympathetically relate to its rural location; neighbouring built surroundings and failed to protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the area. Moreover, Policy 26 of the HDPF stated that any development that took place in the countryside must be of an essential nature but, the Council did not consider that this size of building was essential for the purposes of a quiet informal recreational use which, in this instance, was stated to be the stabling of horses. As such it was inappropriate development, which was harmful to the countryside and, therefore, contrary to Policy 26 of the HDPF.

(c) To receive an update on any planning appeals

There were none to discuss.

(d) To review options for a Neighbourhood Plan review from the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

Councillor Skeates updated the Council on four options the Working Group had discussed to review the Neighbourhood Plan. The first option was to do nothing which involved maintaining the status quo without undertaking any amendments or development efforts within the Neighbourhood Plan. Existing policies and guidelines would remain unchanged. The second was a light touch review with a minimal revision of the Neighbourhood Plan, introducing minor updates without significant changes to the existing framework. The third was a variation of the current plan which involved drafting a revised plan that included modest housing numbers, potentially meeting some but not all local housing demands. The appeal site at Lower Broadbridge Farm and a revised (15 homes) East of Hayes Lane site along with windfall delivered circa 213 homes. The fourth was a fully revised Neighbourhood Plan incorporating completed housing numbers to meet projected needs comprehensively (see appendices for full analysis). Neither of the options were ideal as a new plan would be too expensive. Therefore, it was recommended that a Management Statement was published to see if the existing plan and sites could satisfy HDC's allocation numbers by 2031. A new plan would then be produced in 2031. Councillor Skeates presented a draft statement for consideration (see appendices) which Councillors **RESOLVED** to adopt subject to minor changes which could be agreed via email as the statement needed to be submitted before the next meeting.

8. Finances and Administration

(a) To review the schedule of payments and bank reconciliation since the 26th June 2025

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the payment schedule and bank reconciliation since the last meeting (see appendices).

(b) To review the latest variance report

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the variance report.

(c) To consider signing a new Section 104 Agreement for the pipework under Six Acres kickabout

Councillors **RESOLVED** to sign the new Section 104 Agreement with Elivia Homes, Southern Water and IVSG Surety Limited which would enable Southern Water to adopt the sewerage/drainage pipework and associated infrastructure for the Welwyn Way development which went under Six Acres kickabout. Councillors Skeates and Walker signed the agreement on behalf of the Council.

(d) To consider any grant applications

There were no applications.

(e) To discuss transferring the Scout Hut land into the Council's name

The Clerk would write to HDC for more information about the transfer process.

(f) To consider the external audit report for 2024-25 and a notice of conclusion of audit

The Clerk presented the external audit report to the Council which he said he was querying. The auditor had requested a breakdown of reserves from the Council and then charged them for sending the email and made comments on the report that the Council should take reserves more seriously. The Clerk had responded to the external auditor confirming the Council takes reserves seriously and reviews them regularly and that he had only followed the AGAR guidance by sending the requested documents which did not include a breakdown of reserves. Furthermore, the AGAR explicitly stated to not send any additional documents. The Clerk had received an acknowledgement from Moore who advised they were considering his comments.

9. Highways and Byways

(a) To receive an update on speeding on the A29 and through the village

The local PCSO had been in the village with a speed gun on a few occasions. The officer responsible for the A29 would be undertaking similar action soon. WSCC had sent results for the data loops from the 20mph zone in the village (see appendices) which showed there was not a big problem with speeding. Some residents had come forward to volunteer for a Speedwatch, so it was agreed to advertise again in the magazine to get more.

(b) To discuss designated footpaths in the parish

A resident had approached the Council about the designation of footpaths in the parish. The orange paths in the below photo were not designated and the resident had questioned why this was the case. The Chair said that he had started gathering evidence a few years ago to submit the relevant DMMO application and had around 12 witness statements. Councillors **AGREED** it was a time-consuming process, so they asked the Clerk to look for external assistance and to see if the resident was interested in helping.



(c) To discuss the road sign on the junction of the Street and Lyons Road

The sign was with the Community Shed so the Clerk would ask for a quote to repair it.

(d) To discuss Hayes Lane drainage

The Clerk had contacted WSCC about part funding a repair to the pipe and was waiting for a response.

(e) To discuss bus services in the parish

Councillor Slipper reported that some residents had used Dial a Ride which was quite expensive. The Clerk had asked the Deputy Clerk to research a Community Bus for Slinfold.

10. Grounds and Buildings Maintenance

(a) To discuss the building survey and maintenance of Slinfold Stores.

The Clerk had contacted several contractors with a specification but had not received any response.

(b) To receive an update on the draft easement for access to the air conditioning units at Slinfold Stores.

There was no update.

11. Recreation, Youth and Environment

(a) To receive an update on the freehold of some land at Slinfold Golf Course.

The Clerk had contacted the trustees to see if they would carry out the transfer and deed of variation following issues with the Council's appointed solicitor. They responded saying they would execute the transfer but not a deed of variation to amend clause 2.2 which currently put the insurance obligation on the freeholder and not the leaseholder. Their response was that the golf club had been always paid the insurance and there was no obligation on the freeholder to pay anything. Councillors agreed that one of the conditions of taking over the freehold was that the insurance obligation was amended whereupon it was **RESOLVED** to respond to the trustees advising that they could not take it on unless it was amended accordingly.

(b) To discuss new litter bins in the village

Councillors **RESOLVED** to purchase replacement bins for Lowfield Road, Slinfold Primary School, Westway and Slinfold Stores and use the funding from the Councils Environment Cleansing reserve. All bins would be the same as the newly purchased one at Spring Lane except outside the shop which would be a double for waste and recycling.

(c) To receive an update on plans for enhancing biodiversity in the parish.

A report from Wilder Horsham District was presented (see appendices). The Clerk advised there was a grant to which the Council could apply but some of the initiatives required discussions with the tennis and football clubs, so it was agreed to wait until the next Cherrytree Committee meeting in September.

(d) To discuss maintenance of hedges, trees and ditches

It was agreed to defer this item until the next meeting. The Deputy Clerk had been asked to report a tree near Westway which required attention to WSCC.

12. Committees and those on Outside Bodies

To receive any updates.

The Community Shed had achieved charity status and the new vicar for Slinfold had been officially licensed and would be moving into the vicarage soon.

13. Communications

To discuss any articles for the parish magazine.

Speedwatch, data from speed loops and Management Statement.

14. Items for the next agenda

There were no suggestions.

15. Next meeting dates

Council meeting: 25th September 2025

Parish Council Report – July

Local Government Reorganisation - Public Survey

Have your say on the future of local government in West Sussex: councils launch public survey

Residents, businesses and community groups across the county are being invited to share their views about the future of their councils as part of an important survey, live now.

The survey asks respondents about where they live or work, the council services they use, as well as their thoughts about how their council could be structured in the future.



[Take the Shaping West Sussex survey](http://www.shapingwestsussex.org)

Sussex Six

An upcoming food and drink event in Horsham Town Centre will feature Sussex Super Chefs cooking their signature dishes live.

The Sussex Six Market on Sunday 7 September will bring local produce, street food, live music and fun for all the family to Horsham's Carfax.

Celebrity chefs Matt Gillan of The Woodcote; Kenny Tutt and Miranda Gore-Browne of Parham House Cookery School; Alex Dome from Knepp Wilding Kitchen and Joshua Mann from Camellia at South Lodge will showcase their skills using Sussex produce, hosted by food guru Hilary Knight.

The market event, organised by Food Rocks and Horsham District Council, is in support of the Sussex Six Campaign, managed by Natural Partnerships, which aims to increase the availability of local produce on menus and shop shelves in the county.

The Sussex Six Market features alongside the Horsham Tap & Vine Takeover, organised by Firebird Brewery, Your Horsham and Visit Horsham. Thirteen pubs and venues throughout Horsham will be showcasing local drinks and celebrating the town's vibrant hospitality scene all weekend. Pick up your Tap & Vine Passport from participating venues from 5-7 September and experience delicious locally brewed beers, ciders and wines from breweries and vineyards in the district.

Local residents and visitors are encouraged to keep an eye out for further details on the Sussex Six Market on the Food Rocks website at: <https://foodrockssouth.co.uk/sussex-six-market/> and Tap & Vine Takeover Weekend on the Your Horsham website at: www.yourhorsham.com/tap-and-vine/.

Nature Recovery Award

Funding reopens to support nature recovery



Our Nature Recovery Award fund, set up in partnership with our Wilder Horsham District project and the Sussex Wildlife Trust is OPEN again for new applications.

We can fund up to £5,000 each to support landowners and community groups wishing to implement practical schemes to expand and improve networks for wildlife across the Horsham District landscape. The Sussex Wildlife Trust also offer site visits to help support and develop your project ideas. **The fund closes on 29 August.**

[Read about our past recipients](#)

[Apply for a Nature Recovery award](#)

Annual Canvas

Each year we are required to contact all households in the District to ensure the information that we hold on the Electoral Register is correct. Over the next week, we will be sending approximately 50,000 emails to residents in relation to the annual canvass. We will be sending forms and further

emails in the coming months. Information is available on our website

– www.horsham.gov.uk/annual-canvass.

Forms will be sent out throughout August, September and October in addition to this, and will specify whether residents need to respond, or not.

Any emails will be sent from the returning officer at Horsham District Council.

Residents can respond online, or they can call (01403 215126) if they have queries or are unable to use the website.

Option Analysis for Slinfold's Neighbourhood Plan 2

Informative note for SPC prepared by SNPWG.

Introduction

Slinfold's Neighbourhood Plan 2 (SNP2) could represent another pivotal opportunity for the community to shape its future development, housing, and infrastructure (e.g. Scout Hut) projects in alignment with local needs and values. The current Plan is out of date and Horsham's failure to produce its own Local Plan has meant the district is extremely vulnerable to speculative development with a presumption in favour of the developer and Horsham stating they are unlikely to finance planning appeals.

Without a Local Plan in place, even a new Neighbourhood Plan will be significantly less effective. Neighbourhood plans without a local plan can still influence development—but their effectiveness is significantly constrained. This is principally because:

Legal Status vs Strategic Vacuum

- A neighbourhood plan becomes part of the **statutory development plan** once adopted, so it carries legal weight in decision-making.
- However, it must be **in general conformity with strategic policies**—which are usually set out in the local plan. Without one, there's a **strategic policy vacuum**, making conformity harder to assess and weakening the neighbourhood plan's authority.

At a recent workshop on Neighbourhood Plans, Horsham indicated a figure for Slinfold of 20 homes per annum i.e. 300 homes over a 15 year Plan period. This is significantly more than the 13 per annum we had expected to deliver and will require the allocation of one or more additional sites in the parish. Past experience tells us this will be controversial and unsettling.

This document outlines four potential options for the SNP2, analysing their implications, benefits, and drawbacks to help identify the most viable path forward.

Option 1: Do Nothing

Description: This option involves maintaining the status quo without undertaking any amendments or development efforts within the Neighbourhood Plan. Existing policies and guidelines would remain unchanged.

Advantages:

- No immediate costs associated with updating or drafting a new plan.
- Can still update Design Statement to maintain current village character.

Disadvantages:

- Fails to address housing demands or population growth, potentially exacerbating affordability and availability issues.
- Limited control over planning decisions as external authorities may intervene to enforce compliance with broader policies.
- As our original Plan is now over 5 years old, HDC have discretion to reduce the CIL receipt from 25% to 15%.
- Limits the opportunity to adapt to changing community needs and environmental priorities.

Option 2: Light Touch

Description: A minimal revision of the Neighbourhood Plan, introducing minor updates without significant changes to the existing framework.

Advantages:

- Low-cost option requiring limited investment in time and resources.
- Preserves the essence of the current plan while addressing minor discrepancies.
- Minimises disruption to community dynamics.

Disadvantages:

- Will not be accepted by HDC as a valid 'update' as it improves only superficial aspects of the plan and will not adequately address housing shortages or other pressing issues.
- Fails to satisfy long-term sustainability or development goals.
- Leaves critical infrastructure and housing gaps unresolved.

Option 3: A Plan with Modest Housing Numbers

Description: This approach involves drafting a revised plan that includes modest housing numbers, potentially meeting some but not all local housing demands. The appeal site at Lower Broadbridge Farm and a revised (15 homes) East of Hayes Lane site along with windfall deliver circa 213 homes.

Advantages:

- Balances development needs with preserving village character.

- Provides a proactive step toward addressing housing concerns without overwhelming the community.
- Enhances local control over planning while aligning with broader policies.

Disadvantages:

- HDC unlikely to accept delivery figure of 213 homes substantially below their anticipated 300 homes.
- May not hold any water at planning committee as HDC may disregard it.
- May still fall short of meeting housing targets, prolonging affordability issues.
- Parish resource will be required to negotiate reduced figure with HDC.
- Will incur significant costs which will not be able to be recouped due to lack of external funding from Government and HDC.
- Likely to require Examination and Referendum.
- Delivers smaller CIL receipt for larger infrastructure projects.

Option 4: A New Plan with Full Housing Numbers

Description:

Advantages:

- Allows Parish to locate housing where it wants sites to be developed.
- Fully addresses housing demands, ensuring affordability and sustainability.
- Aligns with external authorities' expectations, avoiding intervention or enforcement measures.
- Creates a forward-looking framework that accommodates future growth and innovation.

Disadvantages:

- One or more new sites will need to be allocated as the target figure will be circa 286 homes and exceeds identified site capacity. This will require a 'call for sites' alerting all speculative developers.
- Higher costs and resource demands for drafting and implementing the new plan. The previous Plan cost circa £40k. Anticipate £50-100k with no external funding.
- Likely to require Examination and Referendum.
- Could face resistance from community members concerned about large-scale changes.
- Requires careful planning to mitigate potential environmental and infrastructure challenges.

Costs

Updating a neighbourhood plan in the UK can vary widely in cost depending on the scale of changes, the complexity of the area, and the level of professional support needed.

Here's a breakdown:

Typical Cost Range

- Minor updates (non-material changes): Often handled internally with minimal cost, but not eligible for government grant funding.
- Substantive updates (requiring examination but no referendum): Local planning authorities can claim £10,000 in government support once the revised plan comes into force.
- Major updates (requiring both examination and referendum): Eligible for £20,000 in funding support.

Estimated Total Costs

- Government estimates suggest full neighbourhood plans (including updates) can cost between £20,000 and £86,000, depending on scope and complexity.
- Additional costs may include:
 - Consultation & engagement: £1,500–£5,000
 - Strategic Environmental Assessment: £10,000–£30,000
 - Masterplanning documents: Up to £50,000/year for consultants

Conclusion

Each of the four options presents distinct advantages and challenges for Slinfold's Neighbourhood Plan. While "Do Nothing" reduces immediate effort, it carries significant risks of stagnation and external intervention. "Light Touch" offers minimal adjustments but fails to address deeper issues. A plan with modest housing numbers strikes a balance but may not fully resolve housing needs and consequently may fail. Lastly, a new plan with full housing numbers provides the most comprehensive solution but requires significant investment and negotiation.

The choice ultimately depends on the community's priorities, available resources, and willingness to embrace change. It is critical to engage stakeholders, conduct thorough impact assessments, and seek professional advice to ensure the selected option aligns with Slinfold's long-term vision and sustainability goals.

Next Steps

SPC to review paper at July 2025 meeting and consider making recommendation to SNPWG of preferred route forward.

Slinfold Parish Council Management Statement for Meeting Housing Needs - July 2025

1. Introduction

Slinfold has a “Made” Neighbourhood Plan up until 2031 and has embarked on making a new Plan from that date.

Horsham District Council (HDC) has however withdrawn its new draft Local Plan (July 2025) and is beginning the process of drawing up a new Plan in accordance with the Government’s new standard method of determining housing need/targets. HDC has also given some guidance to Neighbourhood Planning in their recently published Planning Advice Note – “Shaping Development in Horsham District” and extracts of that note are appended at Appendix A

Slinfold Parish Council has been advised that the housing numbers in its Made Plan, which was made more than 5 years ago, may not be immune from the “tilted balance” as described in NPPF Paragraph 11d and their housing numbers may be considered out of date due to HDC being unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply.

This “Management Statement” has been prepared to augment the “Made” Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP) to demonstrate that within its area Slinfold has sufficient housing land and allocations to meet the new Government needs/targets in accordance with their Standard Method of calculating those needs/targets if applied proportionally to individual Neighbourhood Plan Areas.

With this Management Statement in place, the PC will have a clear tool to demonstrate compliance with national housing requirements, defend local character, and manage growth strategically to 2031.

Several local communities have adopted parallel approaches—formalising a concise “management statement” or equivalent note to demonstrate compliance with the Standard Method and to bolster their neighbourhood-level policies when resisting speculative applications.

Slinfold housing needs/targets

HDC has advised that if the Standard Method of calculation were applied to Slinfold it would mean allocating 20 units per annum. i.e. in the 7 years up until the end date of the SPNP (2031) allocations of $20 \times 7 = 140$ units need to be provided.

Implementing and adopting this Statement will:

- **Provide a defensible housing “budget” for Slinfold to 2031**
- **Strengthen the PC’s position in planning consultations**

- **Highlight that identified sites (Hayes Lane; Lower Broadbridge Farm) already satisfy local needs**
-

2. Methodology

1. Extract the district-wide housing need figure from the Standard Method (per Government guidance).
 2. Calculate Slinfold's share by:
 - Dividing total rural village population by total rural village population in Horsham District
 - Multiplying that ratio by the district-wide Annual Local Housing Need (ALHN)
 3. Project cumulative need from present day to 2031.
 4. Cross-check against the Made Neighbourhood Plan allocations.
-

3. Housing Need Calculation

Metric	Value
Horsham District ALHN (2025–31)	1,338 dwellings p.a.
Slinfold population	1,985 residents
Slinfold proportional share of ALHN	1.5% i.e 20 dwellings p.a.
Slinfold proportional share ALHN 2025-2031	$7 \times 20 = 140$ dwellings

4. Integrating with the Made Plan

- The Made Neighbourhood Plan allocates 77 units to 2031.
- 48 units have been built from allocated sites to 2025, 19 windfall units have been developed upto March 2024, giving a total of 67 units, i.e. 10 units unallocated.
- An additional 133 units have been granted planning at Appeal at Lower Broadbridge Farm (LBF).
- Our proportional Standard Method target to 2031 is now 140 units.

- With 10 unallocated units from the 2018 Plan and 133 at LBF we therefore have 143 units allocated ie 102% of our calculated need is now covered, leaving a 3 unit “surplus.”

This surplus can be used as a material consideration inter alia to:

- **Refuse or negotiate down speculative schemes that exceed our residual requirement**
 - **Cap proposals on individual sites at figures supported by infrastructure constraints**
-

5. Site-Specific Analysis

East of Hayes Lane

- **Proposed: 15 dwellings in linear form along Hayes Lane**
- **Management Statement position:**
 - **This scheme falls well within the 143 unit delivery numbers.**
 - **Surface water drainage improvements are a prerequisite condition**
 - **Parish will support no more than 15 dwellings here**

Boundary Site (adjacent parish)

- **Proposed: 93 units**
 - **Statement notes:**
 - **Combined with Slinfold’s existing delivery, local housing supply exceeds need**
 - **Adds weight to PC objections if this site is advanced speculatively**
-

6. Adoption Process

1. Draft Review – PC NPWG Committee reviews and refines Statement
2. PC resolves to progress with Management Statement 31st July 2025
3. Public Consultation – 4-week parish wide consultation online
4. Formal Resolution – PC meeting to adopt Statement as a material consideration
5. Publication – Post on parish website; circulate to HDC and neighbouring parishes

7. Utilising the Statement in Planning Responses

- **Quote the headroom figures when commenting on applications**
- **Attach the Management Statement as an appendix to all PC objections**
- **Emphasise Parish Council commitment to meeting need within current Plan period**
- **Reference drainage, character, infrastructure constraints to reinforce ceilings**

8. Summary

This Management Statement updates the numbers of housing within SNP area indicating that the needs/targets set by Government can be met without further allocations. New targets will be considered on a needs basis in a new SPNP that is underway post 2031. The new drafting (including the necessary consultations) and will take account of HDC policies as they emerge in their new Local Plan.

In addition to these two sites there is an approval for 93 units adjoining the SNP boundary that will provide a retirement village together with ancillary facilities that will cater for the Neighbourhood Plan area's community needs.

Next Steps

- **Circulate to HDC and neighbouring PCs for coordination (ensures joined-up approach on cross-boundary sites).**
- **Use examples (and citations) in consultation to demonstrate proven track record.**

Future Work

- **Begin scoping a new Neighbourhood Plan in 2028**
- **Align emerging policies with Horsham District Council's draft Local Plan**
- **Refresh proportional calculation when HDC publishes its updated ALHN**
- **Engage community on housing mix, climate adaptation, and infrastructure**

Time: 10:37

CO-OP

List of Payments made between 01/07/2025 and 31/07/2025

<u>Date Paid</u>	<u>Payee Name</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Amount Paid</u>	<u>Authorized Ref</u>	<u>Transaction Detail</u>
01/07/2025	Horsham District Council	DD	338.00		Dog bins
03/07/2025	NEST	DD	23.52		SB June
16/07/2025	Horsham District Council	DD	44.55		Litter bins
20/07/2025	Community Shed	BACS	132.56		Noticeboard village hall
31/07/2025	Playsafety Ltd	BACS	462.00		Playground inspections (89892)
31/07/2025	Slinfold Village Hall	BACS	213.00		2160/2165/2166
31/07/2025	John Pilkington	BACS	248.80		July salary
31/07/2025	Samantha Bell	BACS	248.14		Salary July
31/07/2025	Mike Simpson	BACS	1,949.59		July salary
31/07/2025	LGPS	BACS	689.85		MS July 25
31/07/2025	Tony Burroughs	BACS	179.40		Salary July
31/07/2025	The Cut Flower Garden	BACS	94.50		0093- geraniums
31/07/2025	Carl Osborne	BACS	890.00		Grounds Maintenance 482

Total Payments	<u>5,513.91</u>
-----------------------	-----------------

<u>Bank Statement Account Name (s)</u>	<u>Statement Date</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Balances</u>
CO-OP	30/06/2025		48,144.79
			<u>48,144.79</u>
<u>Unpresented Payments (Minus)</u>		<u>Amount</u>	
		0.00	
			<u>0.00</u>
			48,144.79
<u>Unpresented Receipts (Plus)</u>			
		0.00	
			<u>0.00</u>
			48,144.79
		Balance per Cash Book is :-	48,144.79
		Difference is :-	0.00

Signatory 1:

Name Signed Date

Signatory 2:

Name Signed Date

Detailed Receipts & Payments by Budget Heading 31/07/2025

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<u>100 Income</u>							
118 Horsham Lottery	50	0	(50)			0.0%	50
1076 Precept	37,659	75,317	37,659			50.0%	
1080 Bank Interest	124	8,180	8,056			1.5%	
1090 CIL Income	17,654	0	(17,654)			0.0%	17,654
1100 Grants Received	500	2,500	2,000			20.0%	500
1120 Environment Cleansing	1,897	3,700	1,803			51.3%	1,897
	<u>57,884</u>	<u>89,697</u>	<u>31,813</u>			<u>64.5%</u>	<u>20,101</u>
Income :- Receipts							
	<u>57,884</u>	<u>89,697</u>	<u>31,813</u>				
Net Receipts							
6001 less Transfer to EMR	20,101						
	<u>37,783</u>						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve							
<u>200 Administration</u>							
4000 Clerk & Environment Officers	16,291	54,000	37,709		37,709	30.2%	
4025 EO Expenses	47	500	453		453	9.4%	
4055 Training	0	150	150		150	0.0%	
4060 Audit	193	650	458		458	29.6%	
4070 Legal & Consultancy	25	30	5		5	83.3%	
4075 Bank Fees	0	30	30		30	0.0%	
4080 Subscriptions	731	720	(11)		(11)	101.5%	
4091 Chair's Allowance	0	400	400		400	0.0%	
4100 Insurance	0	2,000	2,000		2,000	0.0%	
4110 Recruitment & Training	0	100	100		100	0.0%	
4120 Home Office	0	180	180		180	0.0%	
4130 Hall Hire	357	600	243		243	59.5%	
4135 FC Office Hire	0	300	300		300	0.0%	
4140 Website and email	560	570	10		10	98.2%	
4150 Software	203	350	147		147	58.0%	
4160 Stationery/printing	0	100	100		100	0.0%	
	<u>18,406</u>	<u>60,680</u>	<u>42,274</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>42,274</u>	<u>30.3%</u>	<u>0</u>
Administration :- Indirect Payments							
	<u>(18,406)</u>	<u>(60,680)</u>	<u>(42,274)</u>				
Net Payments							
<u>250 Football Club</u>							
1200 Rental Income	0	150	150			0.0%	
1205 Insurance Reclaimed	0	330	330			0.0%	
1210 Grounds Maintenance Reclaim	0	650	650			0.0%	
	<u>0</u>	<u>1,130</u>	<u>1,130</u>			<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0</u>
Football Club :- Receipts							

Detailed Receipts & Payments by Budget Heading 31/07/2025

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
4200 Repairs & Improvements	165	0	(165)		(165)	0.0%	
Football Club :- Indirect Payments	165	0	(165)	0	(165)		0
Net Receipts over Payments	(165)	1,130	1,295				
<u>255 Tennis Club</u>							
1200 Rental Income	0	150	150			0.0%	
1205 Insurance Reclaimed	0	359	359			0.0%	
1210 Grounds Maintenance Reclaim	0	520	520			0.0%	
Tennis Club :- Receipts	0	1,029	1,029				0
Net Receipts	0	1,029	1,029				
<u>260 Community Shed</u>							
1205 Insurance Reclaimed	0	92	92			0.0%	
Community Shed :- Receipts	0	92	92				0
Net Receipts	0	92	92				
<u>270 Slinfold Stores</u>							
1200 Rental Income	250	1,000	750			25.0%	
1205 Insurance Reclaimed	0	354	354			0.0%	
Slinfold Stores :- Receipts	250	1,354	1,104			18.5%	0
4200 Repairs & Improvements	750	0	(750)		(750)	0.0%	750
Slinfold Stores :- Indirect Payments	750	0	(750)	0	(750)		750
Net Receipts over Payments	(500)	1,354	1,854				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	750						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	250						
<u>300 Community Services</u>							
4310 Community Events	2,523	3,200	677		677	78.8%	510
4320 Youth Services	2,410	8,600	6,190		6,190	28.0%	
4370 Newsletters/Promotions	1,478	2,700	1,222		1,222	54.7%	
4390 Grants Made	0	1,000	1,000		1,000	0.0%	
4395 Cosy Café	855	2,500	1,645		1,645	34.2%	855
Community Services :- Indirect Payments	7,265	18,000	10,735	0	10,735	40.4%	1,365
Net Payments	(7,265)	(18,000)	(10,735)				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	1,365						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	(5,900)						

Detailed Receipts & Payments by Budget Heading 31/07/2025

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<u>350 Recreation</u>							
4200 Repairs & Improvements	133	0	(133)		(133)	0.0%	
4400 Bin collection	302	385	83		83	78.4%	
4405 Dog bins	507	1,180	673		673	43.0%	
4410 Grounds Maintenance	0	1,172	1,172		1,172	0.0%	
4412 Grounds Maintenance Extra Cuts	415	0	(415)		(415)	0.0%	
4420 King George V	935	470	(465)		(465)	198.9%	
4425 Six Acres	1,438	1,800	362		362	79.9%	1,438
4430 Playground Inspections	0	215	215		215	0.0%	
4435 Grounds Maintenance Cherrytree	1,240	2,300	1,060		1,060	53.9%	
Recreation :- Indirect Payments	<u>4,969</u>	<u>7,522</u>	<u>2,553</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,553</u>	<u>66.1%</u>	<u>1,438</u>
Net Payments	<u>(4,969)</u>	<u>(7,522)</u>	<u>(2,553)</u>				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	1,438						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(3,531)</u>						
<u>400 Highways & Byways</u>							
4510 Streetlights & Maintenance	1,213	7,100	5,887		5,887	17.1%	
Highways & Byways :- Indirect Payments	<u>1,213</u>	<u>7,100</u>	<u>5,887</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5,887</u>	<u>17.1%</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Payments	<u>(1,213)</u>	<u>(7,100)</u>	<u>(5,887)</u>				
<u>999 VAT Data</u>							
115 VAT on Receipts	318	0	(318)			0.0%	
VAT Data :- Receipts	<u>318</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(318)</u>				<u>0</u>
515 VAT on Payments	700	0	(700)		(700)	0.0%	
VAT Data :- Indirect Payments	<u>700</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(700)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(700)</u>		<u>0</u>
Net Receipts over Payments	<u>(382)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>382</u>				
Grand Totals:- Receipts	58,452	93,302	34,850			62.6%	
Payments	33,469	93,302	59,833	0	59,833	35.9%	
Net Receipts over Payments	<u>24,983</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(24,983)</u>				
plus Transfer from EMR	3,553						
less Transfer to EMR	20,101						
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>8,435</u>						