

## Budget Consultation Responses – General Fund

### Statutory Budget Consultation Responses

Consultee	Response
Measham Parish Council	The budget proposal seems fair, however parity among all Councils with respect to funding would, we believe increase services in all areas.

### Enhanced Public Consultation – Summary of Responses

	Supportive or very supportive	Neutral or did not answer	Unsupportive or very unsupportive	Themes from comments
<b>On the NWLDC Council Tax Freeze</b>	<b>79 (55%)</b>	26 (18%)	39 (27%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 49 residents left detailed comments on the council tax freeze.</li> <li>• Nine suggested they would be happy with an increase in council tax. One thought it should be reduced.</li> <li>• Six commented that they were happy with the freeze as long as services were not being cut.</li> </ul>
<b>On increasing the Special Expenses Council Tax</b>	<b>35 (39%)</b>	23 (25%)	32 (36%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This question only applied to the 90 respondents that live in a special expenses area, 42 left comments.</li> <li>• Those that were supportive were happy for the increase, with some mentioning that it should lead to better service, with suggestions of more dog waste bins and efforts to reduce vandalism.</li> <li>• Those that were unsupportive commented on the fairness of different council taxes in different areas and suggested that these areas were not being maintained.</li> </ul>
<b>Changes to Fees and Charges</b>	49 (34%)	<b>71 (49%)</b>	24 (17%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 33 respondents left comments.</li> <li>• 8 commented that fees for removing waste encourages fly tipping. 1 was supportive of this fee if it was invested in recycling facilities.</li> <li>• 3 commented that the fees for Newmarket were too high.</li> <li>• 2 felt a 5% increase in burial fees was too much.</li> <li>• 3 respondents agreed with our</li> </ul>

				charging policy – to recover costs and generate a profit where possible – whilst another 3 disagreed with this approach.
<b>Changes to day to day services</b>	<b>56 (39%)</b>	54 (37%)	34 (24%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 58 Residents provided comments.</li> <li>• The most common comment related to development within the district, with 11 residents raising concern about the level of development and how that was compatible with our plans to reduce our carbon footprint and plant trees.</li> <li>• 10 residents commented on our plans to reduce our carbon footprint. 4 were negative about the idea, suggesting it was too much and we should be looking at improving local transportation instead. 5 were positive, with suggestions that we should start with solar panels on the council building.</li> <li>• 9 commented on our plans to provide free trees and increase funding for maintaining trees. 6 were negative, citing the high cost whilst 4 were positive.</li> </ul>
<b>Capital Expenditure plans</b>	<b>52 (36%)</b>	41 (29%)	51 (35%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 55 residents left detailed comments on our capital expenditure plans.</li> <li>• 17 left negative comments on the investment in Appleby Magna Caravan.</li> <li>• There were 11 negative comments relating to the new leisure centre and one positive one.</li> <li>• The plans to demolish the existing market hall generated 25 comments. Most were expressing their views on what to do with the site, with common suggestions being bars, a cinema or a train station. Using the site for housing was unpopular. Five felt we should not be demolishing the hall before we decide what to do with it.</li> <li>• 4 commented on the lack of investment in northern parishes, such as Castle Donington and Kegworth.</li> </ul>