

Payment of Information Commissioner's fee by Direct Debit

1. Organisations that process personal data are subject to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018 and under the Data Protection (Charges and Information) Regulations 2018 (the Regulations) they must also pay an annual data protection fee, unless they are exempt. Parish Councils are not exempt.
2. The fee is now £40 per annum and is due to be paid in December of each year. However if paid by Direct Debit the fee is reduced to £35 per annum.
3. Broadmayne Parish Council's Financial Regulations do allow for certain payments to be made by Direct Debit. Regulation 6.7 provides as follows:

6.7 If thought appropriate by the Council, payment for utility supplies (energy, telephone and water) and any National Non-Domestic Rates may be made by variable Direct Debit provided that the instructions are signed by two members and any payments are reported to the Council as made. The approval of the use of a variable Direct Debit shall be renewed by resolution of the Council at least every two years.
4. Clearly this fee is not a utility but it seems sensible to pay it by way of Direct Debit to take advantage of the discount. It will also reduce administration and involve one less cheque being produced. By virtue of Financial Regulation 18.2, the Council may by resolution suspend Financial Regulations, provided that a risk assessment has been carried out and notified to Councillors.
5. As Direct Debit payments are covered by the standard Direct Debit guarantee provided by all banks and the payee is a government agency this appears to be a low risk action.
6. I therefore recommend that the Parish Council resolves:
 - a. to suspend Financial Regulation 6.7 to allow for the Information Commissioner's fee to be included as a payment to paid by means of Direct Debit; and
 - b. to make an instruction to Santander to pay the fee by Direct Debit.
7. I also recommend that, in due course, Financial Regulation 6.7 be amended to allow for the payment of certain other regular invoices by way of Direct Debit.

Storm damage at the eastern end of the village

1. Councillors will recall that at the November meeting of the Parish Council the following was reported during the public participation session:

19/141 (i) A member of the public said that during the storm on Saturday 2 November there had been two incidents involving fallen road-side trees at the eastern end of the village; a vehicle had been hit and the entry “gates” to the village had been damaged. He requested that other trees in the vicinity be examined. He also reported that the unofficial lay-by at the eastern end of the village was being used by HGVs to park overnight and for fly-tipping.

2. These problems were reported to our Community Highways Officer at Dorset Council. He replied to say that:

- He believed that the maintenance/insurance of 'gateways' rests with the relevant parish but that the highways department could provide a cost for repair/reinstatement if required.
- Regarding trees, a tree officer had been asked to make a site visit. He agreed that one branch in particular was “unacceptably low over the highway” and needed to be removed but he said that it wasn’t a highway tree so he would need to make contact with the landowner with a view to getting it removed.
- He would keep an eye on the unofficial lay-by for problems and raise jobs for repairs as necessary.
- Any fly-tipping at the locality needs to be reported directly to DWP.

3. I subsequently researched the history of the ‘gateways’. They were paid for by the Binnegar quarry operatives from funding they provided to parishes as recompense for their lorries using local roads. They were installed by Dorset County Council. As the Parish Council didn’t pay for them they were never put on the Parish Council’s asset register. I assume it was imagined that DCC would pay for any on-going maintenance. It is quite clear that Dorset Council will not pay for any subsequent work.

4. Although the ‘gateways’ have not actually fallen over (indeed one has been pushed into a more upright position by someone), they are rotten at the base where they enter the soil. I have requested an estimate for repair of the ‘gateways’ from the highways department but at the time of writing it has not been received.

5. I will report further on this matter once that estimate has been received.

Janet Davis, November 2019

NALC Small Councils Committee: voting for Dorset candidates

Below is an e-mail received from two parish councillors in Purbeck who have been nominated for this committee. The Parish Council has the vote, not individual councillors, so the decision on who to vote for needs to be made at a council meeting. You have three votes.

If you have any problem with the link to the NALC website please let me know and I'll forward you the original e-mail.

Dear Members

RE: NALC Small Councils Committee - Dorset Candidates are Sarah Jackson [West Lulworth PC] and Josephine Parish [Corfe Castle PC].

Recently DAPTC forwarded an email from NALC to all eligible councils regarding nomination to the Small Councils Committee. Voting opened on 15th November and will close on 13th December.

To qualify to vote your council must:

A] be a member of DAPTC and

B] have an electorate of 6000 or fewer

*The link below will take you to the small councils election page, at the bottom click on 'candidates'. The list of candidates will appear and you will be able to highlight each one and read their submission. At the bottom of the list there is a 'click here' which will let you vote. Once in the voting page you will see that you can **choose THREE** candidates.*

It is important to note that where councils are grouped, each individual council can still vote separately despite all sharing the same contact address.

<https://www.nalc.gov.uk/smaller-councils-committee-elections>

There are three committee positions available in England and NALC has received 12 nominations. We think it is very important that Dorset is represented on the committee and hope that, together with the Devon candidate Michele Wilson, we will be able to ensure that small councils across the South West have a voice at a National level.

We have attached our nomination papers for your convenience. Currently, Josephine has been supporting the need for a full residency policy, encouraging Parish and Town councils to respond to the Climate Emergency and together we continue to

lobby for genuinely affordable houses rather than what's currently on offer. I'm in contact with Dorset Council to review the 21day limit for Parish and Town Councils to respond to planning applications, and I've also been in correspondence with DC attempting to reverse the decision barring Town and Parish Members contacting Dorset Council officers directly. We've both recently given evidence at the Inspection of the Purbeck Plan.

We sincerely hope that your council will feel able to support our election to this committee and that you will vote for us.

If you have any questions we can be contacted directly by email at the above address, or on 07974841613.

Best wishes

Cllr Sarah Jackson

West Lulworth Parish Council

Cllr Josephine Parish

Corfe Castle Parish Council

Response to Dorset Council's draft plan

1. At the November Parish Council meeting it was agreed that Councillors would send their comments on the draft plan to the Clerk who would draft a response for consideration at the December Parish Council meeting.

2. Your comments were as follows:

Phil

I have read this document and I have no strong comments about it. My overall impression is that the plan was clear to read with helpful statistics. The plan looks positive for the county as a whole and was explained with as much detail as a single document could be.

The proof is in the pudding of course, but I liked the plan and would like to see how this all works in practice.

I may have had stronger opinions if the plan had supporting documents with more specific details about how each item will be implemented and how stakeholders will be consulted. This is something which may follow further down the line.

Sam

The Plan seems to incorporate all the things that we would want to see for the future of Dorset in theory. All of the objectives and priorities include working with Parish and Town Councils and if the Plan delivers then we cannot ask for more.

At this stage I don't have any useful comments to add, and having looked at the consultation survey I cannot see why we would disagree with any of the proposed priorities suggested. If we are being asked for more priorities we might underline the need for the voice of smaller parish councils to be heard when considering the development and infrastructure of rural areas.

Peter

Overall the plan is well produced and easy to follow if a little 'motherhood and apple pie'. Areas that might be developed in future drafts:-

1. Outcomes to be made fully Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART).
2. Address conflicting priorities (e.g. economic growth v environment and service v tax cost)
3. Risks, dependencies and scenario planning
4. Financial information

I agree that we should state our priorities in terms of infrastructure.

Chris

I agree with most of the points that Peter makes - it is more aspiration than hard targets. Think this is well illustrated by transport which I think is important and cuts across many areas. They note in the economic growth they will improve transport - then in how they say "work to improve rail services and public transport and reliability of journey times". Exactly how they would achieve this, given who owns the rail franchise and lack of control of buses, is somewhat of a mystery and they ignore this element in who they will work with. It pops up again in stronger communities to keep Dorset connected with better transport. Then ignore the how and the who. So a disconnect between some of the sections.

In the unique environment part they do not mention being made a National Park and seem to ignore fly tipping plus other similar comments - as Peter said - somewhat apple pie in character with a nice diagram but lacking a more practical hard edged approach.

Steve

I think that the comments already made amount to the basis of a suitable reply. I think it's unfortunately in the nature of this type of paper for many of the issues Peter raised to be lacking. But there is no harm in encouraging them to be more focused on SMART, no harm in being more practical than aspirational and no harm at all in asking 'how?'.

No further points from me.

Thanks to all for the input.

3. It appears that the response has to be made via an on-line form. For each of the five sections (economic growth, unique environment, suitable housing, strong health communities and staying safe and well) the question is asked “Do you think this should be one of our priorities? Answer: yes, no or I’m not sure. The final question is “Do you think we should have anything else as one of our priorities for the next four years?” Answer: yes or no. There is then a box in which to give further feedback.

4. I would suggest that you answer yes—all five headings should be priorities. But I am not sure what you want to say about the addition of any further priorities. I suggest the following text for inclusion in the feedback box:

Broadmayne Parish Council welcomes Dorset Council’s intention, stated in all of the objectives and priorities, to work with town and parish councils but wishes to underline the need for the voice of small parish council’s to be recognised when considering the development and infrastructure of rural areas.

Broadmayne Parish Council recognises the limitations of such a broad and far reaching plan in respect of detail but suggests that areas which should be developed in future drafts include:

- *SMART outcomes (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound)*
- *The addressing of conflicting priorities (e.g. economic growth v environment and service v tax cost)*
- *Risks, dependencies and scenario planning*
- *Financial information*

Broadmayne Parish Council would also welcome more detail on how the very welcome aspirations are to be achieved. For example, the vital issue of transport which cuts across many areas. Under the heading of economic growth, there is an aspiration to “improve transport” by working “to improve rail services and public transport and reliability of journey times” but how this would be achieved is unclear given the ownership of the rail franchise and the bus companies.

The Parish Council also notes that under the heading of unique environment there is no mention of the possibility of the creation of a National Park in Dorset, or of the huge problem posed by fly-tipping across the authority’s area.

The Parish Council is also concerned that there is little or no mention of the cultural life of Dorset and the vital work of organisations such as Artsreach which takes cultural activities out to villages and towns making use of village halls and other local facilities, or of the many museums and historic properties which attract visitors and contribute to the sense of belonging of residents and the vibrancy of communities.

Janet Davis

November 2019

Provision of sandbags in Broadmayne

1. When the Parish Council owned the old Doctor's surgery at the cross-roads it built a small wooden lean-to shed attached to the surgery wall as a store for emergency sandbags. It was locked with a combination lock and the Clerk and each of the Parish Councillors was provided with the combination which could be given to residents who needed sandbags if there was a flooding emergency.
2. When the surgery was sold the sandbags were moved to the village hall car park and stored under a tarpaulin to the right of the entrance where they have remained ever since. The tarpaulin is now covered with ivy and other vegetation which I will endeavour to clear because it's not immediately obvious that it is the sandbag store.
3. Sandbags were provided by the district council and are now provided by Dorset Council. Dorset Council keeps a record of where the bags are stored and the details of any key-holder which they update every year when they ask if any further bags are required (currently my details are held even though the bags are not locked away). Simply keeping the bags under a tarpaulin is not a good way to keep them as they do deteriorate so we need to find a solution to this problem.
4. One solution would be to utilise the old grit bin from the Black Dog car park (which Dorset Council will not now fill with grit because it's not on the highway, and which is now empty) and move it to the village hall car park and then get a dumpy bag of sand from Dorset Council (and bags) and let people fill the bags themselves from the bin as necessary.
5. This matter has been brought to a head because, recently, when we experienced very heavy rain I had two telephone calls from residents of Martel Close looking for sandbags because water was pouring down their drives. They had been given my details by Dorset Council. I explained where the sandbags were and said that they were welcome to take as many as they needed although I couldn't guarantee their condition.
6. Moving the old grit bin to the village hall car park may well necessitate getting a concrete base built.
7. This short report is an update on the present situation. I will investigate further and report back in due course.

Janet Davis, November 2019