

Dear Annalisa,

Thank you for your email to James in connection with CIL funding and changes to the minimum project threshold.

James is concerned to hear of the situation you have set out and the potential impact on smaller parish council's accessing the fund. Obviously this is primarily a decision for the local council – have you asked your borough councillor to raise this?

James would be happy to raise this with the Borough Council; please can you let us know if you are content for your correspondence and personal details to be shared with the Council?

We look forward to hearing further from you.

Best wishes,

Eleanor

The Office of James Wild MP



Sign up [here](#) for my weekly newsletter

I am delighted to have run the **London Marathon** in support of the **8:56 Foundation** who do such important work for men's mental health across North West Norfolk. To donate please visit www.justgiving.com/page/jameswildmp

From: "Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk"

Sent: 10 June 2026 16:20

To: james.wild.mp@parliament.uk

Subject: CIL funding Changes

Dear James,

I hope you are well.

I am writing on behalf of Docking Parish Council regarding recent changes to the Borough Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding criteria, and to ask whether you might be able to assist.

The Borough has introduced a minimum project threshold of £10,000 for CIL applications. In practice, this excludes many smaller parish councils from accessing the fund.

The decision appears to take little account of the scale at which small councils operate. For many villages, a significant infrastructure project is often in the region of £3,000–

£6,000. These are not minor or cosmetic works; they are projects that can have a meaningful and lasting impact on the community.

For example, improved security measures for allotments can cost around £3,000. Renovating a village sign using traditional materials and creating coordinated planting schemes can cost £6,500. Creating a heritage trail with new pathways, interpretation boards, seating and accessible routes can cost around £6,000. New white lines and traffic calming measures – under £5000

These are precisely the sorts of projects parish councils undertake to improve local infrastructure, support tourism, enhance public spaces and strengthen community wellbeing. Yet under the revised criteria, none of these projects would qualify. Nor are councils permitted to combine smaller projects in order to reach the threshold.

Even where a council can identify a qualifying project, the required 20% contribution towards a £10,000 scheme means finding at least £2,000 from its own resources. For many small parish councils, that represents a significant proportion of the annual precept and places projects beyond reach.

There is also a concern that the introduction of a £10,000 minimum threshold may itself be influencing project costs. Once it becomes known that projects below that figure are ineligible, there is an obvious risk that quotations begin to gravitate towards the threshold, making value for money harder to achieve.

Councils rely on grants like these annually to make these projects happen, combined costs are huge, and not being able to access funding to steadily work through them is a big disadvantage. For Borough to say they are disappointed in the ambition of projects and to want to encourage grander thinking highlights a disconnect between the needs of the smaller parishes, and what 'grand ambition' looks like in a small parish, and the Borough council's approach.

The result is that smaller communities, with the smallest budgets and least financial flexibility, are effectively excluded from a funding stream intended to support local infrastructure improvements. This seems entirely at odds with the purpose of the fund,

which should be enabling communities to deliver the infrastructure they need, regardless of their size.

I have heard similar concerns from a number of parish councils and clerks across the area, suggesting this is not an isolated issue.

I would be grateful if you could look into this matter and consider raising it with the Borough Council. The current criteria appear to overlook the realities of small parish councils and deny many rural communities access to funding that should be available to them.

I would be interested to hear your thoughts.

Best wishes,

Annalisa

Parish Clerk / Responsible Financial Officer
Docking Parish Council

UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.

From: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Sent: 30 June 2026 11:03
To: 'Julie Costley'
Subject: RE: Update on Highways LMF and the Norfolk Community Fund

Hi Julie,

Thank you. I have forwarded this and the below to council and it will be on the next agenda

Please may I ask a couple of questions to clarify as they will need to be answered for the Parish Council to consider how to accommodate

1. **The most important question:** Will existing LMF agreements be honoured for projects that have already been approved or are currently underway?
2. **Was an impact assessment carried out to quantify how much external funding parish councils would no longer be able to access as a result of withdrawing the LMF?**

My reason for asking is that the LMF is widely used as match funding for larger grant applications. While this appears to be an £11,000 saving, the real impact is potentially much greater because removing the LMF also removes access to many other funding opportunities.

If that £11,000 represents even 10% of the 20% match funding required by parish councils, then its removal could prevent access to around £110,000 of external funding.

Was this wider financial impact considered, and if so, how does the County intend to support parish councils in addressing it?

The economics do not seem to balance. Rather than saving £11,000, the decision potentially creates a funding gap of around £110,000 that will either have to be met through increased precepts and council tax or will result in essential projects not going ahead. These are often environmental improvements and highway safety projects that directly benefit local communities.

3. **Did the County also consider the impact of the recent CIL changes?**

The minimum CIL grant has increased to £10,000, requiring a £2,000 match contribution. For many smaller parish councils, that represents 5–10% of their annual precept and is simply unaffordable without LMF assistance.

Again, this is not simply a loss of £500–£1,000 from a parish council's budget. It can mean losing access to grants worth £10,000–£100,000 because the required match funding is no longer available.

For example, Docking Parish Council was able to secure funding to install two new SAM units because the LMF provided the necessary match funding. Without the LMF, that funding would not have been accessible. In practice, removing the LMF would have meant Docking losing around £6,500 of investment, resulting in no new SAM units, no additional traffic data, and no corresponding road safety improvements.

From a parish council perspective, removing the LMF appears to have a disproportionately large impact, and it is difficult to see how that is justified by an £11,000 saving.

Is the County planning to introduce any alternative form of support to help parish councils fill the significant funding gap that this decision has created?

Kind regards,
Annalisa

From: Julie Costley <julie.costley.cllr@norfolk.gov.uk>

Sent: 26 June 2026 18:37

To: clerk@bircham-pc.gov.uk; clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk; clerk@sedgefordparishcouncil.gov.uk; Clerk | Snettisham Parish Council <clerk@snettishamparishcouncil.gov.uk>; East Rudham Parish Council <clerk@eastrudhamparishcouncil.gov.uk>; Sue Eke <office@heacham-pc.gov.uk>; West Rudham Parish Council

<clerk@westrudhamparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Subject: Update on Highways LMF and the Norfolk Community Fund

Dear Parish Clerks

This is an information email for the Parish Councillors regarding changes to county council funding within communities. I will include it in my report for your July meetings but I thought you may appreciate an earlier heads-up as to what is actually happening and why.

Essentially, a decision has been taken by the Reform administration to redeploy extra funding of £650k to the Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service and £924k to Highways.

This has been done by reallocating the funds from the Highways Local Member Fund (£11k) and the Norfolk Community Fund (£5k).

Our Fire and Rescue Service is under pressure, with activity increasing by 73% over the last 5 years. This has left the service unable to manage within their agreed budget and facing an unsustainable position. Taking this decision means that we can remove some of this risk and uncertainty and increase our confidence that the service is able to focus on keeping us safe and saving lives.

We recognise the LMF has supported many projects over the years however with an estimated £80m highways maintenance backlog we want to support Highways in tackling this. The reallocated £924k will be ring-fenced across four operational areas (North, South, West, City). Funding will be distributed proportionally based on the number of local councillors and used for larger, strategic maintenance works, such as resurfacing and preventative pothole treatments. While councillors will no longer directly control small budgets, we will still influence priorities through local highways teams.

I appreciate there will be some disappointment that these two Funds will not continue this year, but hope we can show that this has been done to support our critical services who do not have the funds they need to keep us safe.

Please be assured there is much work ongoing with finances and we remain focused on prioritising frontline services, reducing waste and delivering value for taxpayers.

Kind regards
Julie

Cllr. **Julie Costley**

Norfolk County Council: **Docking** Division
Teams number : 01603 223611

I, **Julie Costley**, am a data controller and am committed to protecting the privacy and security of the personal information you give to me or that I hold about you. "Personal information" means any information about you or from which you can be identified.

This privacy [notice](#) describes how I collect and use personal information about you in my role as a county councillor in accordance with data protection legislation. If you have any questions about this

privacy notice or how I handle your personal information, please contact me at julie.costley.cllr@norfolk.gov.uk

--

To see our email disclaimer click here <http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>

From: Heidi Wedge <Heidi.Wedge@West-Norfolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 June 2026 12:30
To: clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Subject: RE: 26/00118/BOC - Limagrain UK Ltd Station Road Docking Norfolk PE31 8LS

Afternoon

I can advise that I have now been contacted by the Developers, Engineering Contractor concerning the outstanding highway works who is now liaising directly with Norfolk County Council Highways Officer in order to progress the outstanding matters. I have been asked to be included in any further correspondence moving forward and once I am aware of any future dates for site meetings or works I will ensure to update you further. This is promising and lets hope that progress is made in due course.

In the meantime, if I can be of any further assistance, then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Heidi Wedge – *Planning Enforcement Officer*
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk

T: 01553 616449/07766 421 374

F: 01553 616652

E: Heidi.wedge@west-norfolk.gov.uk

W: www.west-norfolk.gov.uk

View recent planning applications: <http://online.west-norfolk.gov.uk/publicaccess>

Submit a planning application on-line: <http://www.planningportal.co.uk>

From: Heidi Wedge
Sent: 18 May 2026 12:18
To: 'clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk' <clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: 26/00118/BOC - Limagrain UK Ltd Station Road Docking Norfolk PE31 8LS

Afternoon

I can now advise that the Planning Contravention Notice (PCN) has now been returned advising that “A transport consultant has been instructed by the company to contact the Council to discuss the requirements of Conditions 18 and 19 of the planning permission and of the s278 agreement, with a view to arranging a meeting on site to discuss what needs to be done”.

On this basis I am now liaising with Highways and will continue to monitor progress and if at anytime moving forward we are not satisfied that progress is being made then it will be necessary for further action to be considered in the form of a Breach of Condition Notice being issued.

I hope that this explains the local planning authority’s position in this matter, however, if I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Heidi Wedge – *Planning Enforcement Officer*
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk

T: 01553 616449/07766 421 374

F: 01553 616652

E: Heidi.wedge@west-norfolk.gov.uk

W: www.west-norfolk.gov.uk

View recent planning applications: <http://online.west-norfolk.gov.uk/publicaccess>

Submit a planning application on-line: <http://www.planningportal.co.uk>

From: Heidi Wedge

Sent: 08 May 2026 13:53

To: 'clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk' <clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Subject: 26/00118/BOC - Limagrain UK Ltd Station Road Docking Norfolk PE31 8LS

Afternoon

Thank you for bringing to our attention the breach of planning control concerning the above.

I have been requested by another party for an update on the above case and thought I would take this opportunity to also share this with yourselves.

I can advise that I am liaising with Highways regarding the outstanding highway works and that a site visit has been carried out and that I have contacted the developer advising of what action is required concerning– Conditions 18 and 19 of approval 19/01654/OM, however, to date I have not received any response.

During my site visit it was observed that the open space area was being worked on/landscaped I took various photos of the landscaping in place including the post and rail enclosure.

The case was taken to a Case Review and presented to colleagues it was considered that the landscaping works were in accordance and that the post and rail would be covered by permitted development. However given that no response had been received from the developer concerning Conditions 18 and 19 it was agreed to issue a Planning Contravention Notice (PCN) which is a tool whereby we can obtain information which legally requires a response.

I can confirm that the PCN has now been sent and If we do not receive a response to the PCN then further enforcement action will be considered in the form of a Breach of Condition Notice being issued.

I hope that the above explains the Local Planning Authority's findings and actions taken to date and intentions, however, If I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Heidi Wedge – *Planning Enforcement Officer*
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk

T: 01553 616449/07766 421 374
F: 01553 616652
E: Heidi.wedge@west-norfolk.gov.uk
W: www.west-norfolk.gov.uk

View recent planning applications: <http://online.west-norfolk.gov.uk/publicaccess>
Submit a planning application on-line: <http://www.planningportal.co.uk>

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20147/about_our_website/470/disclaimer

Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2020 08:40
To: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Subject: Raindeer in memory of Lisa

Good morning I'm writing to ask if the [REDACTED] could donate a raindeer in memory of Lisa , Lisa loved the Christmas lights and I think it would be a fitting tribute to Lisa she was the glue and voice of reason between the parish and the club and we would like to honour that with the gift of a Christmas light . When the lights first went up it was Lisa that reach out for help putting the lights up so that where are thought came from

Sent from [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 May 2026 08:48
To: parishclerk@burnhammarketparishcouncil.gov.uk; clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Subject: Pond restoration

Dear Annalisa, as Clerk to Burnham Market and Docking Parish Councils,

Below is the email I sent to [REDACTED] cently. But it sounds like it may be relevant for Docking if they are keen to restore a number of ponds.

Carl Sayer is an aquatic expert and [REDACTED], he has been pushing ponds on the agenda with DEFRA and is always keen to speak about ponds (or Black Shuck), so there is plenty of his work online which explains all the benefits of ponds.

The more ponds in an area, the better, so if the council's ponds are not eligible for either of these schemes, maybe you can encourage any of the local farmer's to put their land forward. Old Ordnance Survey maps can be accessed online from the National Library of Scotland, so you can locate any ghost ponds within an area.

<https://maps.nls.uk/geo/find/marker/#zoom=5&lat=56.0000&lon=-4.0000&f=0&z=1&marker=56.0,-4.0&from=1450&to=2000> – you can zoom in to any area.
<https://maps.nls.uk/view/120847055> - Docking as an example.

Massingham did some great pond restoration in 2023 I think. So, they might be a good council to approach in terms of enquiring about funding and process.

Good luck, and let me know if you need any further resources.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] :57

To: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I hope you're well.

I know you've spoken to [REDACTED] about footpaths between Deepdale and Burnham, but this is a slightly different topic – ponds.

Norfolk FWAG (Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group) have been working with the county council on some pond restoration. They have already done one on our farm, but we've been told they have some more money. We don't have any other old ponds, but I suggested maybe the one in Burnham could be part of the project. I'm talking about the one at the junction of Whiteways and Church Walk, beside the old surgery. It has looked very sad and unloved for some time and would be amazing to see it come alive again.

I wondered if this was on privately owned land, or part of the parish council's responsibility? If privately owned, do you know by who? If parish council, would you be interested in having it restored?

As yet, we're not sure if the pond restoration fund can be used outside of farmland, but I said I would enquire about who owned this one. The way it worked for us was that they covered all the restoration and then look after and maintain it for the next 25 years... so it's a great opportunity if it qualifies.

This is the scheme - <https://norfolkfwag.co.uk/pond-restoration/>

But there is also the Norfolk Ponds Project is this doesn't work out - <https://norfolkponds.org/>

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Sent: 22 June 2026 13:37

To:

Hiya,
This resident has ideas about ponds, and is aware the council is canvassing resident opinion on possible future projects.

Thanks,
Annalisa

From: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk <Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 13:35
To: 'XXXX XXXX' <XXXXXXXXX@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: Project/space needing help

Hiya XXXX,

Thank you.

Docking PC does have a ponds project in development – very early stages – so I will forward your email to the council to include in consideration. Very interesting – the idea of offering offset Biodiversity Net gain credits.

May I clarify – are you talking about the pond on Stanhope Road, or the pond in Stanhoe?

Thanks,
Annalisa

From: XXXX XXXX <XXXXXXXXX@hotmail.com>
Sent: 22 June 2026 12:58
To: clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Subject: Project/space needing help

Dear PC - I am responding to the invitation in the May village newsletter about "a project or space you'd like the council help with".

Last year I raised the suggestion of a Docking Ponds Project.

The suggestion was to look at all the ponds, decide a 30 year strategy to
 Stage one: bring all of the ponds into a natural healthy state
 Stage two: maintain them

And for this strategy to be offered to developers (anywhere in the country) to fund the strategy as a biodiversity offset for their development.

Unfortunately, the spare time I had available last year has now been taken by a different project so I will not be able to be involved in taking this idea forward.

However, the pond on Stanhoe is rapidly becoming overrun by plants and in a couple of years or more will no longer have any open water. I have not seen any wildfowl on the pond this year and this valuable wildlife asset is under threat. I would be grateful if the parish council could advise what can be done about this.

Kind regards

XXXX XXXX

XXXXX

Sent from [Outlook for Android](#)

Time capsule project

How to Create a Village Timecapsule

Creating a village time capsule involves a collaborative effort to preserve the community's history and culture. Here are some steps to guide you in creating a village time capsule:

1. **Define the Purpose:** Determine the reason for creating the time capsule, whether it's to commemorate a significant anniversary, celebrate community achievements, or promote local heritage.
2. **Identify the Audience:** Consider who the time capsule is intended for, such as future residents, descendants of current community members, or broader audiences interested in local history.
3. **Choose Themes:** Identify themes that resonate with the community, such as cultural diversity, innovation, or resilience, to guide the selection of items and the overall narrative of the time capsule.
4. **Gather Items:** Collect items that are meaningful to the community, such as photographs, letters, artifacts, and other memorabilia that capture the essence of the village during that era.
5. **Seal and Store:** Once you've gathered all the items, seal the capsule and store it in a safe place, such as a local school or library, to ensure it remains preserved for future generations.

FYI: Heacham have one in their village sign.

DOCKING HERITAGE GROUP

Chairman Paul Hewitt
Hon Sec Helena Aldis
Treasurer Gabby Mortlock

21st June 2026

Dear Clerk, Chairman and Councillors,

We have taken note recently of the discussions and correspondence about the Docking village sign. Various people in the village have asked what our opinion is about the renovation, as it is seen as a part of the village heritage/history. Initially the renovation work was seen as necessary and inevitable, after all its around 90 years old now.

Interestingly this week in the Heritage Room, the discussion took another turn and after some chat and polling of members and friends of Docking Heritage Group, we would like to propose that the old sign is carefully removed and perhaps sited somewhere else in the village (ORG?) and that we have a brand new village sign in prime position on the green, that reflects the village in the 21st century and displays some of its more recent history.

This seems the perfect opportunity to replace the old sign completely. We have many examples of more interesting signs locally. Other villages around us have some very eye catching and exciting new signs. We are sorry to say it, but ours is quite frankly, boring; it is of a certain era and reflective of the design of the time.

Perhaps the Parish Council could consider promoting a competition for a new design incorporating certain themes or aspects of history. Some of the ideas mooted to us have been Saint Henry Walpole, our village saint: sugar beet, reflecting the discovery of a crippling crop disease and its treatment by world renowned chemist, Dr Ripper; wheat and barley reflecting the production of new varieties of cereals and seed production here since the early part of the 20th century and the importance of agriculture in the community; bread, indicating the importance of the Waggs Bakery active here for many years and an significant part of the local economy; the water tower indicative of the name 'Dry Docking' and the lack of mains water until the 1930s; the Tett Turrets, our unique WW2 installation.....I am sure people can come up with others.

Is this not an opportunity for the PC to get people engaged and especially the children of the community?

We realise that this is a contraversial view and not all village people will agree. Heritage isn't just about preserving individual items, it is about sharing our history with others and making people aware of the importance of past events and times to our present community.

We politely ask you to consider this proposal,

Yours sincerely,

Helena Aldis

DHG Hon Sec

helena.aldis@btinternet.com

13:57 Mon 22 Jun

74%



 **Community Speedwatch**
To: Rita Goid >

13:42

A nice Email

Hello Rita and Team,

Please see below, a nice email regarding the team and a letter sent.

I want to thank you for writing to let me know I was found speeding through Docking on the 5th June 2026. I have no excuses to offer, only that the car was new to me having purchased it a couple of days before, and Docking was a place I wasn't familiar with. I am very sorry and somewhat ashamed of myself because I should have been extra aware for those two reasons! This is my first driving offence in 60 years and I will make sure it will be my last!

I live in a village and am constantly cross with the drivers who take no notice whatsoever of the 20 mph signs and am very grateful to our Community Speed Watch Team as they try to keep us safe.

I was driving the car and my husband, the main driver, has taken some delight in that I was caught, meaning I can never nag him if he speeds, but I surely will!

All this has made me realise how fortunate I am that the Police did not get involved, but have given me a warning only, this time!

So, strange no doubt as this email is, again I say 'thank you' for informing me of my mistake and educating me about keeping our roads safe.

Kind regards

Julie

Julie Bathgate
Income & CSW Administration Officer, Road Safety
Specialist Operations – Criminal Justice Services (CJS)
Norfolk and Suffolk Constabularies
PO Box 3293
Norwich, Norfolk NR7 7ET
Tel: 07989196331
Please note I am currently working from home, I can be contacted via email and teams
www.norfolk.police.uk
www.suffolk.police.uk



This e-mail carries a disclaimer

Go here to view [Norfolk Constabulary Disclaimer](#)

BRIEFING NOTE: MEMORIAL DONATIONS TO PARISH COUNCIL

1. Purpose

This note considers whether the Council should accept memorial or commemorative donations and outlines the governance risks and available policy approaches.

2. Background

The Council has been approached (and may be in future) to accept memorial-style donations or items for public display. These may include physical objects, installations, or sponsored features in public spaces.

Such requests often arise in emotionally sensitive circumstances and may involve individuals with links to Council members or strong local views.

3. Key Issue

The issue is not financial but governance-based: whether the Council can make consistent, transparent, and defensible decisions on memorial donations without undue pressure, perception risk, or precedent problems.

4. Risks Identified

4.1 Reputational risk

- **Perception of favouritism or inconsistency**
- **Public disagreement over appropriateness of individuals or memorials**

4.2 Governance risk

- **Emotional or relational pressure influencing decision-making**
- **Difficulty applying consistent criteria over time**
- **Precedent leading to expectation of approval in future cases**

4.3 Operational risk

- **Long-term maintenance and replacement obligations**
- **Health and safety considerations for installed items**
- **Ongoing administrative burden**

4.4 Political / perception risk

- **Potential conflict where individuals linked to Council members are involved**
 - **Risk that decisions are perceived as personal rather than corporate**
-

5. Options Available

Option A — Accept memorial donations (case-by-case)

- **Requires strict policy and full Council decision each time**
- **Higher administrative and reputational burden**

Option B — Controlled memorial scheme

- **Only pre-defined types of memorials allowed (e.g. benches/trees in set locations)**
- **Clear criteria and limits reduce discretion and pressure**
- **More consistent and defensible**

Option C — Do not accept memorial donations

- **Council declines all memorial or commemorative donations**
 - **Eliminates inconsistency and perception risk**
 - **Removes emotional and political pressure from Council decisions**
-

6. Consideration

Memorial donations are inherently sensitive and often generate disproportionate governance complexity relative to their practical benefit.

Councils commonly adopt either a restricted scheme (Option B) or a non-acceptance position (Option C) to maintain consistency and protect decision-making integrity.

7. Conclusion

The Council should determine whether it wishes to:

- **continue making ad hoc decisions on memorial donations, or**

- **adopt a clear policy that either restricts or declines them entirely to avoid repeated case-by-case pressure decisions.**

DOCKING PARISH COUNCIL

ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS POLICY

1. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to set out how the Council considers, accepts, or refuses donations offered to it.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all donations, including:

- Money
- Gifts of equipment or items
- Sponsorship or in-kind support
- Memorial or commemorative items

It does not cover grants, which are managed under Financial Regulations.

3. Principle

The Council may accept or refuse any donation. No donation is accepted automatically.

All decisions must be made in the interests of the Council and the community.

4. Decision-Making

All donations must be decided by **Full Council only**.

No delegation applies.

No donation may be accepted or confirmed outside a Full Council resolution.

5. Considerations

The Council will consider:

- Community benefit
- Cost and ongoing maintenance
- Legal, safety, and insurance issues

- Long-term responsibility
- Reputation and public perception
- Whether acceptance could imply influence or obligation

6. Memorial Donations

Memorial or commemorative donations require particular sensitivity.

Option A: Council does not accept Memorial donations

Option B: Council has a memorial scheme (where plaques can be purchased for positioning on council benches where available OR ANY OTHER IDEAS)

Option C: Council considers all memorial donations and request on a case by case basis and will consider:

- Community views
- Appropriateness
- Suitability for public space
- Long-term maintenance

The Council may refuse any memorial donation it considers unsuitable or divisive.

7. Gifts and Bribery Risk

Councillors must not accept any gift, donation, or benefit where it could reasonably be seen as:

- influencing Council decisions, or
- rewarding a decision, or
- creating obligation or preferential treatment.

Any such offer must be refused or referred to Full Council or the Code of Conduct.

8. Conditions

The Council may attach conditions to acceptance, including:

- Use or display restrictions
- Maintenance responsibilities
- Location or duration limits
- Recognition or anonymity requirements

If conditions are not acceptable, the donation will be refused.

9. Ownership and Liability

Accepted donations become Council property unless agreed otherwise.

The Council must be satisfied it can meet any ongoing costs or liabilities before acceptance.

10. Transparency

All decisions must be recorded in Council minutes.

Accepted donations may be recorded in the asset register where appropriate.

11. Review

This policy will be reviewed every three years or sooner if required.

From: Julie Costley <julie.costley.cllr@norfolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 16:46
To: clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Subject: FW: Request for Assistance Regarding Serious Concerns Arising from Freebridge Housing Development

Hi Annalisa

My thoughts...

I support the Parish Council's concerns about the impact this development would have on the village, and whether it really is necessary given the current housing stock we already have here, and in surrounding villages, and that optimal use should be made of this before more development takes place.

Regarding the infrastructure problems we already experience, as a result of new developments around the village over the past few years, it would be telling whether Freebridge would legally commit itself via Section 106 to fully fund measures to improve these first e.g. local water network upgrade. 21 houses might not sound much to planners or developers but the cumulative impact on our already strained infrastructure would be significant. More traffic, demand on GP surgery, school places etc.

Local occupancy agreements are not always what they seem either. Timeframes vary but sometimes they don't wait very long, just a matter of weeks, for eligible people to take up the property and if that doesn't happen the boundary is expanded. Placing extra demand on the infrastructure whilst not serving the intended purpose of supporting locals to live here.

I can't comment on the concerns about Freebridge's conduct and approach to the consultation but I certainly see how it is relevant for the Parish Council to raise this.

Thanks for keeping me informed and please do let me know if I can support in any way.

Kind regards
Julie

Cllr. Julie Costley

Norfolk County Council: **Docking** Division
Teams number : 01603 223611

I, **Julie Costley**, am a data controller and am committed to protecting the privacy and security of the personal information you give to me or that I hold about you. "Personal information" means any information about you or from which you can be identified.

This privacy [notice](#) describes how I collect and use personal information about you in my role as a county councillor in accordance with data protection legislation. If you have any questions about this privacy notice or how I handle your personal information, please contact me at julie.costley.cllr@norfolk.gov.uk

From: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk <Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Sent: 22 June 2026 11:26

To: Julie Costley <julie.costley.cllr@norfolk.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Request for Assistance Regarding Serious Concerns Arising from Freebridge Housing Development

WARNING: EXTERNAL EMAIL: Don't open any links or attachments unless you trust the sender. Click [Here](#) for more information.

Hi Julie,

This has been sent to Freebridge and to Borough.

Freebridge have requested a meeting – but they won't say what about. I am not sure they understand that PC is not a business – there are not closed doors meetings. So this is on the next agenda for council to vote and decide in the appropriate route forwards (which would be easier if Freebridge would ask the questions they need via email)

It has also been raised with the Landlords and social housing ombudsman.

Thanks,
Annalisa

From: Julie Costley <julie.costley.cllr@norfolk.gov.uk>

Sent: 18 June 2026 16:12

To: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk

Subject: RE: Request for Assistance Regarding Serious Concerns Arising from Freebridge Housing Development

Hi Annalisa

Thank you for sharing this with me. Can I ask who this correspondence has been sent to and whether there have been any response(s) so far?

Regards
Julie

Cllr. Julie Costley

Norfolk County Council: **Docking** Division

Teams number : 01603 223611

I, **Julie Costley**, am a data controller and am committed to protecting the privacy and security of the personal information you give to me or that I hold about you. "Personal information" means any information about you or from which you can be identified.

This privacy [notice](#) describes how I collect and use personal information about you in my role as a county councillor in accordance with data protection legislation. If you have any questions about this privacy notice or how I handle your personal information, please contact me at julie.costley.cllr@norfolk.gov.uk

From: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk <Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Sent: 11 June 2026 09:54

To: Julie Costley <julie.costley.cllr@norfolk.gov.uk>

Subject: Request for Assistance Regarding Serious Concerns Arising from Freebridge Housing Development

WARNING: EXTERNAL EMAIL: Don't open any links or attachments unless you trust the sender. Click [Here](#) for more information.

Hi Julie,

I hope you are well. Docking PC has been having issues and concerns around Freebridge and the housing policy and I was thinking you might like to be looped in, and that you might have some thoughts? Below are the concerns email council has raised.

Following recent events relating to a Freebridge Housing development in Docking, the Parish Council is writing to request assistance in addressing a number of serious concerns that have arisen during the planning process and in relation to ongoing housing management by Freebridge within the parish. These concerns are set out below.

1. Freebridge conduct, strategy and engagement in relation to the Docking planning application
 - a. That Freebridge Housing stated there was Parish Council support for the scheme in order to progress the application, at a stage when no consultation had taken place and no such support had been given, and that the application proceeded on the basis of that false representation
 - b. That following the Council's objection, Freebridge Housing stated that the Council had changed its position despite no prior consultation having taken place, and implied that the Council had not properly understood nor competently engaged with the planning documents
 - c. That the scheme would not proceed with a local housing allocation or local occupancy approach for Docking unless Parish Council support was secured, and that if Parish Council support was not given, housing would instead be prioritised on a borough-wide basis and Docking would not be prioritised within that approach, thereby placing pressure on the Parish Council in relation to its response
 - d. That it was also stated that, had the Parish Council not supported the project, it would not have proceeded, but that it was also stated that, due to investment already made, it was "too late" to undo the application, and that Freebridge Housing would not reverse its position based on a false representation of Parish Council support. There is no record of any such support having been given (nor even having been consulted prior to the first objection).
 - e. Concerns are raised regarding the reliance on the local housing needs survey used to support the scheme, including questions as to its independence and impartiality in circumstances where the land had already been identified by Freebridge and the survey was commissioned and funded by Freebridge
 - i. That the interpretation of the survey findings appears flawed; so that reported demand may not represent net additional housing need where respondents are existing Freebridge tenants seeking to move within the existing housing stock, resulting in internal transfers rather than new housing demand and potential vacancies elsewhere within the system
 - ii. that expressions of preference to live in Docking may reflect desirability rather than demonstrable housing need in a settlement with limited employment, education provision and public transport, raising questions as to whether the evidence provides a sound and reliable basis for the scale and location of the proposed development
 - iii. That recent developments in the area have not been filled fully locally (for example Brancaster with 2 from Kings Lynn rather than all local need and where residents from Docking would have been closer and better fulfilled the local need restriction) along with ongoing empty Freebridge properties in Docking.
2. Management of existing Freebridge housing stock
 - a. The Council continues to receive repeated complaints from residents regarding Freebridge housing within the parish, including:
 - i. reports of drug-related activity within certain estates
 - ii. reports of an social behaviour affecting housing areas
 - iii. concerns regarding poor property condition, including damp, mould, and inadequate heating provision
 - iv. delays in repair response, including heating failures during winter periods
 - v. concerns that properties are not being maintained to an acceptable standard of habitability
 - vi. concerns that some properties have remained empty for extended periods, which raises questions regarding the accuracy of stated housing need and allocation pressure within the area

- vii. concerns that properties have in some cases been allowed to fall into such disrepair that Freebridge Housing has indicated they are no longer economical to repair and may be sold or disposed of rather than retained and refurbished to meet ongoing housing need, with the Parish Council considering this approach to be inappropriate in the context of declared housing demand
- 3. Communication and responsiveness: The Council is also concerned about the handling of concerns raised by residents, including
 - a. delayed or inadequate responses to complaints
 - b. lack of clear resolution following reporting of issues
 - c. failure to engage meaningfully with residents raising serious concerns
 - d. loss of confidence in complaints handling and escalation processes

Request for assistance The Parish Council would be grateful for assistance in reviewing and addressing the matters set out above, and for consideration of appropriate responses where relevant.

Given the seriousness of the issues raised, the Council respectfully requests that this correspondence be treated as a formal escalation.

A written response would be appreciated within a reasonable timeframe.

Yours faithfully,

Annalisa

Clerk/ Responsible Financial Officer: Docking Parish Council.

Please be aware that the clerk role is part time and the inbox not monitored out of hours - so I will respond when I am in the office.

Docking Parish Council Website: www.dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk

--

To see our email disclaimer click here <http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>

--

To see our email disclaimer click here <http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>

From: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Sent: 15 June 2026 11:53
To: 'Abbie Panks'
Cc: 'Heidi Bailey'
Subject: RE: Docking Parish Council - Request for Assistance Regarding Serious Concerns Arising from Freebridge Housing Development

Hi Abbie,

Thank you for coming back to me.

I will need to discuss with council the possibility of a meeting as there will need to be a delegate of cllrs and they haven't been selected – or it will need to be full council.

Might you be able to give any further details about the content of the meeting? And in the meantime I will speak with council and come back to you?

Thanks,
Annalisa

From: Abbie Panks <Abbie.Panks@freebridge.org.uk>
Sent: 11 June 2026 15:17
To: clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Cc: Heidi Bailey <Heidi.Bailey@freebridge.org.uk>
Subject: Docking Parish Council - Request for Assistance Regarding Serious Concerns Arising from Freebridge Housing Development

Good afternoon, Annalisa

My colleague has forwarded your email. I'm sorry to hear of your concerns.

I have spoken with our Chief Operations Officer this afternoon and would like to arrange a date with her to come and meet with you.

Can you advise when may be suitable

Abbie

Abbie Panks
Head of Communications and Engagement
Freebridge Community Housing
Direct Dial: 01553 666825
Mobile: 07345 702571

From: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk <Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 June 2026 09:53

To: Feedback <Feedback@freebridge.org.uk>

Subject: Request for Assistance Regarding Serious Concerns Arising from Freebridge Housing Development

Dear Sir/Madam,

Following recent events relating to a Freebridge Housing development in Docking, the Parish Council is writing to request assistance in addressing a number of serious concerns that have arisen during the planning process and in relation to ongoing housing management by Freebridge within the parish. These concerns are set out below.

1. Freebridge conduct, strategy and engagement in relation to the Docking planning application
 - a. That Freebridge Housing stated there was Parish Council support for the scheme in order to progress the application, at a stage when no consultation had taken place and no such support had been given, and that the application proceeded on the basis of that false representation
 - b. That following the Council's objection, Freebridge Housing stated that the Council had changed its position despite no prior consultation having taken place, and implied that the Council had not properly understood nor competently engaged with the planning documents
 - c. That the scheme would not proceed with a local housing allocation or local occupancy approach for Docking unless Parish Council support was secured, and that if Parish Council support was not given, housing would instead be prioritised on a borough-wide basis and Docking would not be prioritised within that approach, thereby placing pressure on the Parish Council in relation to its response
 - d. That it was also stated that, had the Parish Council not supported the project, it would not have proceeded, but that it was also stated that, due to investment already made, it was "too late" to undo the application, and that Freebridge Housing would not reverse its position based on a false representation of Parish Council support. There is no record of any such support having been given (nor even having been consulted prior to the first objection).
 - e. Concerns are raised regarding the reliance on the local housing needs survey used to support the scheme, including questions as to its independence and impartiality in circumstances where the land had already been identified by Freebridge and the survey was commissioned and funded by Freebridge
 - i. That the interpretation of the survey findings appears flawed; so that reported demand may not represent net additional housing need where respondents are existing Freebridge tenants seeking to move within the existing housing stock, resulting in internal transfers rather than new housing demand and potential vacancies elsewhere within the system
 - ii. that expressions of preference to live in Docking may reflect desirability rather than demonstrable housing need in a settlement with limited employment, education provision and public transport, raising questions as to whether the evidence provides a sound and reliable basis for the scale and location of the proposed development
 - iii. That recent developments in the area have not been filled fully locally (for example Brancaster with 2 from Kings Lynn rather than all local need and where residents from Docking would have been closer and better fulfilled the local need restriction) along with ongoing empty Freebridge properties in Docking.
2. Management of existing Freebridge housing stock
 - a. The Council continues to receive repeated complaints from residents regarding Freebridge housing within the parish, including:
 - i. reports of drug-related activity within certain estates
 - ii. reports of an social behaviour affecting housing areas
 - iii. concerns regarding poor property condition, including damp, mould, and inadequate heating provision
 - iv. delays in repair response, including heating failures during winter periods
 - v. concerns that properties are not being maintained to an acceptable standard of habitability
 - vi. concerns that some properties have remained empty for extended periods, which raises questions regarding the accuracy of stated housing need and allocation pressure within the area

- vii. concerns that properties have in some cases been allowed to fall into such disrepair that Freebridge Housing has indicated they are no longer economical to repair and may be sold or disposed of rather than retained and refurbished to meet ongoing housing need, with the Parish Council considering this approach to be inappropriate in the context of declared housing demand

3. Communication and responsiveness: The Council is also concerned about the handling of concerns raised by residents, including
- a. delayed or inadequate responses to complaints
 - b. lack of clear resolution following reporting of issues
 - c. failure to engage meaningfully with residents raising serious concerns
 - d. loss of confidence in complaints handling and escalation processes

Request for assistance The Parish Council would be grateful for assistance in reviewing and addressing the matters set out above, and for consideration of appropriate responses where relevant.

Given the seriousness of the issues raised, the Council respectfully requests that this correspondence be treated as a formal escalation.

A written response would be appreciated within a reasonable timeframe.

Yours faithfully,

Annalisa

Clerk/ Responsible Financial Officer: DockingParish Council.

Please be aware that the clerk role is part time and the inbox not monitored out of hours - so I will respond when I am in the office.

Docking Parish Council Website: www.dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk

This message has been scanned by MimeCast on behalf of Freebridge Community Housing and found to be free of viruses and not SPAM. If you have any concerns about the message contents please contact the ICT ServiceDesk.



Social housing issue?

Visit gov.uk/social-housing





This e-mail (including any attachments), is confidential and intended only for the use of the addressee(s). It may contain information covered by legal, professional or other privilege. If you are not an addressee, please inform the sender immediately and destroy this e-mail. Do not copy, use or disclose this e-mail.

E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error free. The sender does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard copy version.

Freebridge Community Housing Ltd is a Registered Society under the Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014 - Reg No 29744R Registered with the Regulator of Social Housing - No L4463. VAT Registration Number 860762121

Freebridge Community Housing, Juniper House, Austin Street, Kings Lynn, Norfolk PE30 1DZ

This email message has been scanned for viruses by Mimecast.
Mimecast delivers a complete managed email solution from a single web based platform.
For more information please visit <http://www.mimecast.com>



**Regulator of
Social Housing**

Regulator of Social Housing

Level 2
7-8 Wellington Place
Leeds LS1 4AP

T: 0300 124 5225
E: enquiries@rsh.gov.uk
W: www.gov.uk/rsh

Docking Parish Council

23 June 2026

Sent by email: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk

Dear Councillors,

Your referral to the Regulator of Social Housing (regulator)

Thank you for your emails on 11 June 2026 in which you raised concerns on behalf of residents of Freebridge Community Housing Limited (Freebridge) and in relation to an ongoing planning application by Freebridge

Our approach and handling of your referral

We have carefully considered the information you have provided in line with our approach to considering regulatory intelligence. You can find out more about what we consider here <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/factors-for-assessing-regulatory-issues>.

I have set out in an annex to this letter, some background information about our role and how we regulate, taking into account changes introduced in April 2024 by legislation.

The information shared with us

You told us that residents have raised concerns about alleged drug-related activity and anti-social behaviour in some Freebridge properties and estates. You also advised that there have been complaints about delays in repairs and maintenance, including heating repairs during winter, as well as reports of damp and black mould in properties. While you have not verified individual cases, you told us that the volume and consistency of complaints suggest ongoing concerns, with some residents feeling that previous issues raised with Freebridge were not effectively resolved.

You further advised that some Freebridge properties have remained vacant for extended periods and, in some cases, have fallen into disrepair before being sold as uneconomical to repair.

You also told us about Docking Parish Council (the Council)'s concerns in relation to a Freebridge housing development. You outlined concerns about potential misrepresentation of support for the development and concerns about the reliability of a housing needs survey.

Our assessment of the information shared

We have assessed the information you provided and in doing so we considered existing regulatory intelligence we hold relating to Freebridge in relation to the regulatory issues raised in your referral. A link to our regulatory judgement in respect of Freebridge can be found here [Freebridge Community Housing Limited \(L4463\) - Regulatory Judgement: 14 January 2026 - GOV.UK](#). We have not yet formed a view on Freebridge's delivery of the outcomes of our consumer standards as this is a relatively new area of regulation for us and we are working through a programme of inspections through which Freebridge will be assessed

The address for service of any legal documents on RSH is:
Level 2, 7-8 Wellington Place,
Leeds LS1 4AP



We have completed our assessment of the information against the regulatory factors we use for considering how material issues, or potential issues, are to a landlord's delivery of the outcomes of the regulatory standards that we set.

We do appreciate that the concerns you have raised on behalf of the residents are causing them difficulty. The Housing Ombudsman Service (Ombudsman) deals with individual complaints. Based on our assessment of the information, if the residents remain dissatisfied, we consider it is most appropriate to address these matters to the Ombudsman. More information about how residents can raise a complaint with the Ombudsman is available on its website: [Housing Ombudsman Service](#)

Even though we do not have a remit to address individual disputes between tenants and landlords, we do treat information shared with us about how landlords are delivering the outcomes of our standards as helpful regulatory intelligence and have considered the information you provided alongside our wider regulatory intelligence of the landlord.

We have also considered the concerns you raised regarding the planning application. We note that you have submitted a formal objection to the application, which is the appropriate mechanism for raising these issues and ensuring they are considered as part of the planning process. Planning matters fall outside the remit of the regulator. You may wish to raise any questions about the application, the Council's involvement, or the planning decision-making process to the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk, which is responsible for determining the application and considering any representations received.

Concluding comments

Thank you again for sending us information about your concerns, we welcome all information that could support our regulatory intelligence. I am sorry not to be able to provide a direct solution in relation to the issues raised, but I hope this letter is helpful in clarifying our role in relation to these concerns.

Yours sincerely

Nicola Mitchell
Assessment Officer
Nicola.mitchell@rsh.gov.uk

Level 2 | 7-8 Wellington Place | Leeds LS1 4AP

Annex – how we regulate and the regulatory standards

Our role and how we regulate

As the regulator, our aim is to promote a viable, efficient and well-governed social housing sector, able to deliver homes that meet a range of needs. We have both an economic objective and a consumer regulation objective, as set out in legislation. The consumer regulation objective has recently been amended and is now concerned with:

- supporting the provision of social housing that is well-managed, safe, energy efficient and of appropriate quality;
- ensuring tenants having a degree of choice and protection, and the opportunity for involvement in how their home is managed;
- ensuring landlords act in a way that is transparent manner in relation to their tenants of social housing;
- encouraging landlords to contribute to the environmental, social and economic well-being of the areas in which the housing is situated.

To deliver consumer regulation, we have set new consumer standards which are detailed [here](#). Our new consumer standards sit alongside our existing economic standards in setting the outcomes that landlords must deliver for tenants. From 1 April 2024, our integrated regulatory approach puts the regulation of our consumer standards on the same footing as our economic regulation. It allows us to drive improvements in the quality of housing and services in all landlords while continuing to scrutinise the financial viability and governance of housing associations and other private registered providers.

More information about how we regulate can be found [here](#).

The standards relevant to this matter:

Economic Standards

Value for Money Standard

1.1 Registered providers must:

- a) clearly articulate their strategic objectives
- b) have an approach agreed by their board to achieving value for money in meeting these objectives and demonstrate their delivery of value for money to stakeholders
- c) through their strategic objectives, articulate their strategy for delivering homes that meet a range of needs d. ensure that optimal benefit is derived from resources and assets and optimise economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of their strategic objectives.

Governance and Financial Viability Standard

1.1 Governance

Registered providers shall ensure effective governance arrangements that deliver their aims, objectives and intended outcomes for tenants and potential tenants in an effective, transparent and accountable manner. Governance arrangements shall ensure registered providers:

- a. adhere to all relevant law
- b. comply with their governing documents and all regulatory requirements
- c. are accountable to tenants, the regulator and relevant stakeholders
- d. safeguard taxpayers' interests and the reputation of the sector
- e. have an effective risk management and internal controls assurance framework
- f. protect social housing assets

1.2 Financial viability

Registered providers shall manage their resources effectively to ensure their viability is maintained while ensuring that social housing assets are not put at undue risk.

Consumer Standards

Transparency, Influence and Accountability

1.1 Fairness and respect

1.1.1 Registered providers must treat tenants and prospective tenants with fairness and respect

From: Cllr Sam Sandell <cllr.Sam.Sandell@West-Norfolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 June 2026 16:41
To: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Cil Funding changes

Good afternoon

This is the reply I have received from the Cabinet member re your query.

As you know we will be reviewing how this new process works later this year, and all parish council thoughts (such as the one you have forwarded) will be part of that consideration. We have the parish training sessions in coming weeks and I also look forward to receiving feedback from parishes at these meetings.

However, I should say at this stage that CIL is to support infrastructure following development, and is not a fund simply for infrastructure that parishes need, regardless of size.

Best wishes
Sam
Borough Councillor for Burnham with Docking

From: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk <Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 June 2026 12:39
To: Cllr Sam Sandell <cllr.Sam.Sandell@West-Norfolk.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Cil Funding changes

Hiya Sam,
Thanks, I will pass this back to council.

Annalisa

From: Cllr Sam Sandell <cllr.Sam.Sandell@West-Norfolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 June 2026 12:12
To: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Cil Funding changes

Hello

I have emailed the Officer and have asked for a response.

It would have gone through Panels to be decided and then Cabinet I believe.

Best Wishes

Sam

From: Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk <Clerk@dockingparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Sent: 10 June 2026 16:23

To: Cllr Sam Sandell <cllr.Sam.Sandell@West-Norfolk.gov.uk>

Subject: Cil Funding changes

[External Email]

[Confirm the senders email address is genuine, before clicking on links and replying]

Hiya Sam,
I hope you are well.

Docking have asked me to raise the CIL funding changes with you in the hope you might be able to affect some change or assist or advocate

Ad you know, the Borough has introduced a minimum project threshold of £10,000 for CIL applications, which in practice, this excludes many smaller parish councils from accessing the fund.

The decision appears to take little account of the scale at which small councils operate. For many villages, a significant infrastructure project is often in the region of £3,000–£6,000. These are not minor or cosmetic works; they are projects that can have a meaningful and lasting impact on the community.

For example, improved security measures for allotments can cost around £3,000. Renovating a village sign using traditional materials and creating coordinated planting schemes can cost £6,500. Creating a heritage trail with new pathways, interpretation boards, seating and accessible routes can cost around £6,000. New white lines and traffic calming measures – under £5000

These are precisely the sorts of projects parish councils undertake to improve local infrastructure, support tourism, enhance public spaces and strengthen community wellbeing. Yet under the revised criteria, none of these projects would qualify. Nor are councils permitted to combine smaller projects in order to reach the threshold.

Even where a council can identify a qualifying project, the required 20% contribution towards a £10,000 scheme means finding at least £2,000 from its own resources. For many small parish councils, that represents a significant proportion of the annual precept and places projects beyond reach.

There is also a concern that the introduction of a £10,000 minimum threshold may itself be influencing project costs. Once it becomes known that projects below that figure are ineligible, there is an obvious risk that quotations begin to gravitate towards the threshold, making value for money harder to achieve.

Council rely on grants like these annually to make these projects happen, combined costs are huge, and not being able to access funding to steadily work through them is a big disadvantage. For Borough to say they are disappointed in the ambition of projects and to want to encourage grander thinking highlights a disconnect between the needs of the smaller parishes, and what 'grand ambition' looks like in a small parish, and the Borough council's approach.

The result is that smaller communities, with the smallest budgets and least financial flexibility, are effectively excluded from a funding stream intended to support local infrastructure improvements. This seems entirely at odds with the purpose of the fund, which should be enabling communities to deliver the infrastructure they need, regardless of their size.

I have heard similar concerns from a number of parish councils and clerks across the area, suggesting this is not an isolated issue.

I would be grateful if you could look into this matter and consider raising it with the Borough Council. The current criteria appear to overlook the realities of small parish councils and deny many rural communities access to funding that should be available to them.

Council would be interested to hear your thoughts.

Thanks

Annalisa

Parish Clerk / Responsible Financial Officer

Docking Parish Council

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20147/about_our_website/470/disclaimer

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20147/about_our_website/470/disclaimer