

Leatherhead BID Shadow Board – Notes of Meeting

Date: Wednesday 30th July 2025

Start: 10:30am

In-person / Teams

Venue: The Stockroom Society – Swan Centre

Attendance

Role	Name	Business / Organisation
Chair	Richard Keel	Swan Centre Manager
Vice Chair	Rachel Groom	The Stockroom Society
Board Member	Tim Caffell	Leatherhead Theatre
Board Member	Miranda Virgo	Swan Centre
Board Member	Dave Smith	Surrey Hills Radio
Board Member	Mahdi Dolati	Violet London
Consultant	Simon Matthews	Matthews Associates
Observer	Candida Goulden	Mole Valley District Council

1 Welcome & Introductions

Richard welcomed all attendees and thanked Rachel Groom for the use of The Stockroom Society as a meeting venue. It was noted that Kara Nash had moved on from The Edmund Tylney but her deputy Zoey Darbon would be attending in future. Regrettably an urgent personal situation arose that prevented Zoey attending. The Board have sent their best wishes to Zoey and hope she will be able to attend the next meeting.

Simon took the Board through an overview of the agenda emphasising the need for the meeting to guide the production of the outline proposal for MVDC committee meeting on 23rd September. The agenda in the meeting papers set out the flow for the session:

- consultant update (Paper 1),
- draft five-year budget (Paper 2),
- questions on the budget (Paper 3),
- project menu/prioritisation (Paper 4),
- and next steps/timeline (Paper 5).

2 Apologies for Absence

Bruce Shaw – Patrick Gardner

Zoey Darbon - The Edmund Tylney

3 Notes from previous meeting (19/07/25)

Were agreed by the Board item by item with updates on the following listed actions:

ref	Action	Lead	Status / Update
3.1	Circulate signed MVDC loan agreement	SM	Received from MVDC and forwarded to RK and RG, SM reviewed and recommended signing.
6.1	Submit AP01 forms	All	SM reminded Board that he needed all AP10 forms back for submission asap
6.2	Propose additional Board members	All	Cunningham Eve and Jaqui Quinn were discussed again as possible BIDCO Board members
6.3	Confirm MVDC observer	SM	It was confirmed that Candida Goulden would be the MVDC observer
8.1	Circulate draft meeting calendar	SM	SM deferred this until decision on ballot timetable was agreed at this meeting
10.1	Sign MVDC loan agreement	Chair/Vice Chair	RK requested clarification on £500 charge made, awaiting Docusign version from MVDC.
11.3	VAT registration advice	SM	SM has received advice that it is acceptable for BIDCo to register for VAT, which has been done with no implications should ballot be unsuccessful
12.1	Updated Gantt & ballot logistics	SM	SM will do this once ballot date issue is agreed with MVDC, ballot timeline in Board Papers
13.1	Outline BID proposal draft	SM	The main topic of 30 th July Board meeting, outline proposal to MVDC by 4 th August, final version and business plan by early September
14.1	D&O insurance quotes	SM	SM to obtain quote from specialist broker such as Hiscox before next meeting
14.2	Steering Group WhatsApp updated	SM	Done, WhatsApp group updated with summary of meeting

4 Consultant Update Report

4.1. Cabinet approvals and timetable.

MVDC's April minute wording ("subject to consideration of the full business plan") means the proposal and Business Plan must go to Cabinet; MVDC agreed to accept an outline proposal by Mon 4th Aug for inclusion in the Tue 23rd Sept Cabinet pack, on the basis the final Business Plan follows in September. Deferring one Cabinet cycle would miss statutory deadlines by one day.

Notifications to meet the 84-day requirement. Formal letters were sent on Fri 25th Jul: one notifying the Secretary of State and one requesting MVDC to hold the ballot. This was done to satisfy the 84-day rule ahead of the 42-day ballot-notice window.

4.2. Ballot timetable and MVDC's suggested change to the close date

Current plan vs. MVDC suggestion. The Board's working plan is for the ballot to close on Mon 1st Dec (result Tue 2nd Dec, then 28-day standstill to the end of December enabling a 1st Jan go-live). MVDC elections department expressed concern about list-accuracy timing and asked the Board to consider moving the close to Fri 5th Dec (previously they had floated 15th Dec).

Rationale for keeping 1st Dec. The Board chose 1st Dec originally to avoid clashing with peak Christmas trade and to preserve the 1st Jan start if ballot successful. The Board recognised Elections' operational concerns but wanted to avoid pushing the decision into January.

Hereditament list accuracy (mitigation). A joint workplan with MVDC to validate the list up to the 42-day notice was discussed as the preferred mitigation instead of slipping the date. The list is c. 230 hereditaments; the consultant team has already identified errors in the working list used for budgeting (missed entries and incorrect names). A physical check and on-the-ground verification during September engagement was proposed.

Action 4.2 The consultant to go back to MVDC with the Board's preference to retain 1st Dec and adopt the joint-accuracy approach (pre-42 day notice verification; clear channel for corrections prior to the despatch of ballot papers prior to the 28-day voting window).

4.3. British BIDs membership (technical support)

The consultant recommended taking up British BIDs membership on a six-month trial, quoted as being half the price of a full year; at £425 + VAT. The benefit would be access to process/technical advice during the pre-ballot period, with any highly specific legal advice chargeable separately if ever required.

Action 4.3 The Board will join British BIDs as soon as the loan a/c funds are received

5 & 6 Draft Budget and Response to Draft Budget

Budget envelope & cost assumptions (Papers 2 & 3), and programme shape (Paper 4)

Levy envelope. Paper 2 sets a working range £177k–£200k p.a., and uses £180k for illustration pending final hereditament checks. SM circulated a revised potential income calculation based on the most recent hereditament list provided by MVDC. This list indicated a total gross RV of £9,815,700 which based on a 2% levy would generate £196,314 income (before any exemptions, collection costs, non-payments and operating costs). The levy collection cost is awaiting confirmation from MVDC; a working estimate £15k (c.8% of levy) was used, drawing a comparison to Dorking's £16k (noted as a high Surrey benchmark). The loan repayment has now been confirmed over 5 years, not 4, and the PAYE model for a part-time BID Coordinator/Manager is assumed in the draft. The Board were advised the revised budget income would now be in the region of £190,000 per annum for the purposes of budgeting.

Board Q&A themes (Paper 3). Members probed the basis for the collection fee, proportionality per hereditament, and options to negotiate once MVDC confirms the figure. The consultant suggested the current estimate is “safe” for planning; a lower confirmed collection fee would release more for delivery. The paper also sets out modest non-levy income assumptions (c. £5k sponsorship / donations) to be developed for the final Business Plan.

Indicative split. For discussion, Paper 2 item 2.3 used a working split of 32.5% Marketing, 32.5% Events, 10% Public Realm, 10% Enhanced Services (incl. training), 10% Security, 5% Contingency, with the invitation to adjust once priorities were agreed. The consultant noted some towns choose quite different emphases (e.g., high spend on security); Leatherhead should set a balanced, locally-relevant mix which was discussed in a later item (Paper 4).

5a) Minimum hereditament value (£8,000 RV threshold)

What was discussed

Setting a de minimis threshold at £8,000 RV to exclude micro hereditaments from the levy and reduce admin friction/cost per bill raised. Rationale cited: very small premises (kiosks, back-of-house stores, low-turnover micro-retail) generate disproportionately high admin cost relative to levy yield (min £160); exclusion supports start-ups/indies and keeps the BID's focus on deliverables rather than debt-chase on tiny bills.

What was agreed

Adopt a minimum RV threshold of £8,000: hereditaments with Rateable Value < £8,000 will not be liable for the levy. Keep the threshold simple and absolute (no taper), to avoid complexity in billing and appeals. Business Plan / levy rules to state “Hereditaments with an RV below £8,000 are exempt from the levy.”

5b) No levy ceiling (no maximum cap per hereditament)

What was discussed

Whether to apply an upper cap (maximum amount payable per hereditament) to limit large contributors. Points heard for no cap: Keeps the levy proportionate to size and simpler to administer. Avoids a situation where the largest beneficiaries pay relatively less (or are partially shielded) than their scale indicates. The top-payer group is small but important to the overall envelope; capping would reduce resilience in a tight budget.

What was agreed

No levy ceiling will be applied. Each hereditament pays the full calculated levy (rate × RV) subject only to the agreed exemptions/thresholds. Business Plan to state explicitly: “No maximum cap (ceiling) applies to the levy per hereditament.”

5c) Swan Centre tenants (how to handle shopping-centre occupiers)

What was discussed

Principle: bill the occupier of each separately assessed unit in the Swan Centre (as per VOA list), the same as the High Street i.e. no discount on the proposed 2% levy.

What was agreed

Standard approach applies: each VOA-listed unit pays, unless it falls under an agreed exemption (e.g., below RV threshold, qualifying charity rule below). Business Plan to include a short explanatory box: “Shopping centre hereditaments are treated the same as street-front hereditaments; the occupier of each separately assessed unit is liable (subject to exemptions). Add an operational note that the BID will work with the centre manager to maintain accurate occupier records.

5d) Charitable hereditaments (policy & RV threshold)

NB: Rachel Groom and Tim Caffell declared an interest in this item as both being charitable or not-for-profit CIC organisations. They abstained from the final vote on this item.

What was discussed

Balancing support for genuine charitable uses with the need to avoid large, high-RV charities (HQs, large national retailers in prime units) being exempt when they significantly benefit from BID services. Recognition that charities frequently receive mandatory 80% relief (and sometimes discretionary relief on the remainder), meaning some pay no rates in practice. Desire for a clear, binary rule that is easy to explain and apply, and minimises disputes.

What was agreed (by majority, excluding above).

Charitable hereditaments with RV below £70,000: no levy is payable (i.e., exempt). This covers charities and charitable retail in smaller/mid units that are typically fully or largely rate-relieved. Charitable hereditaments with RV of £70,000 or above: liable for the levy at the standard

rate (no discount), on the basis that these are substantial, high-impact premises benefiting materially from BID activity. The rule applies to hereditaments wholly or mainly used for charitable purposes (as defined by the rating list and relief status), assessed per hereditament not per organisation.

Business Plan levy rules to include an explicit clause, e.g.: “Charitable hereditaments with RV below £70,000 are exempt from the levy.” “Charitable hereditaments with RV of £70,000 or above are liable at the standard levy rate.” Add a short interpretation note: the BID will rely on VOA/Ratings status and MVDC relief records to determine charitable status; where usage changes mid-year, liability follows the qualifying date and standard change-in-occupation rules.

Actions from Paper 5:

- 5.1 – Final BID area hereditament value to be confirmed with MVDC
- 5.2 – Consultant team and Board to assist with hereditament list accuracy
- 5.3 – MVDC to confirm levy collection charge, (CG chasing)
- 5.3 – Proposal to state hereditaments <£8,000 RV are levy exempt
- 5.4 - Proposal to state no levy ceiling
- 5.5 - Proposal to state Swan Centre tenants will pay the full 2% levy
- 5.6 – Proposal to state organisations with RV <£70k receiving charitable relief are levy exempt
- 5.7 – Consultant team to reprofile budget with revised numbers based on above

7 & 8 Discussion paper on possible projects, initiatives, activities

The Board considered Paper 4, potential projects, interventions, initiatives and activities for the BID, which following the meeting would be incorporated into the outline proposal for MVDC and over summer will be worked up into the draft full proposal and business plan for publication in September. The Board also noted and welcomed Mahdi Dolati's well-thought-out and helpful paper of ideas. The Board concluded several of Mahdi's initiatives were strong candidates but should be treated as post-ballot opportunities until capacity and partner commitments are in place. Consultant would ensure the draft and final proposals and business left sufficient scope for these to be considered by the Board post-ballot. The Board discussed and considered the paper in order of each theme and potential projects, interventions, initiatives and activities for the BID:

1) Clean & Attractive Streets

The Board discussed, highly visible cleansing (gum & graffiti) on priority routes and gateways; desire for quick, visible fixes that improve first impressions. Planters/street scene were referenced in the context of standards and ensuring gaps in baseline maintenance are escalated/advocated for rather than absorbed by the BID. Conclusion / recommendation for the proposal & final plan was to commit to a targeted gum/graffiti "blitz" programme and a rapid-response mechanism for tagging/fly-posting on priority streets ("over-and-above MVDC baseline" was explicit).

2) Safe & Welcoming Town Centre

The Board discussed, Retail crime intel-sharing tool (DISC) as a typical, affordable BID measure to reduce the cost of crime and increase confidence. Direction: evaluate/adopt subject to local fit with Police and traders. The Board did not want to pursue establishing a permanent security team or specific night-time security initiatives on both a need and cost basis. The conclusion / recommendation was to include: "Evaluate and (if uptake warrants) adopt DISC with Surrey Police/retailers." Keep language to pilot/evidence-led rather than a blanket promise. Close liaison with the Borough Joint Enforcement Team (JET) team was referenced and considered to be an important part of the BID co-ordinators role.

3) Marketing & Promotion

The Board discussed, this theme in detail emphasising the importance to the success of the town, especially in competition with nearby towns such as Dorking and Epsom. The perceived impact of "Hello Dorking" was cited especially their weekly focus on both events and businesses within the town. The need for website, social media and potentially traditional paper leaflet based campaigns was discussed as was the potential to utilise Surrey Hills Radio and its own media network. Measurement of impact was discussed as was ensuring that all BID levy payers received some perceived value from the BID activities. Shop Local type programmes were discussed but Apps such as Dorking's Loyal Free scheme were considered to be expensive with little proven success. The conclusion / recommendation was to include references to extensive marketing and promotion of Leatherhead via multiple channels but with robust result measurement in place. Suitable high-level narrative will be made to allow future incorporation of ideas and suggestions contained within Mahdi's paper.

4) Events & Festivals

As with marketing and promotion this was discussed in some detail. There was some discussion on whether events were purely foot-flow generators vs. actually generating sales within the businesses. It was acknowledged that key events such the Duck Race, Halloween and Christmas Festival were important opportunities to remind residents of Leatherhead as their local centre. The conclusion / recommendation was to include direct reference to restarting an annual events calendar but to be mindful of the foot-flow vs. sales potential conflict, although some Board members confirmed that foot-flow events also generated direct sales. It was acknowledged that organising such events would be both time and potentially levy cost intensive even with sponsorship and external income.

4) Business Support & Development

The Board discussed, collective savings schemes (e.g., energy/waste) as a practical way for SMEs to "save back their levy." Possible targeted, short training for independents (digital/marketing) to strengthen day-to-day trading capability and online presence. The Leret Partnership consultant feedback on the lack of digital footprint for Leatherhead was cited as a challenge. The conclusion / recommendation was to include a collective savings offers (energy/waste) + bite-size training (social/Google Business Profile/visual merchandising) as rolling, low-cost support. Report "savings won" to make the value obvious and audit of before and after online presence in the town.

5) Additional Initiatives and Examples

The Board discussed, access & parking (promotions to support dwell time) which included pragmatic parking levers e.g., selected-day subsidies / support for RingGo fees (if applicable) to encourage dwell at key trading moments (especially around Christmas). The conclusion / recommendation to include the desire to explore tactical parking promotions with MVDC and operators (e.g., selected-day offers) aligned to the Christmas/Winter period.

With respect to investment & vacancies (business attraction), the Board discussed the need for the BID Co-ordinator's proactive place-marketing/investor liaison role: to track expanding chains and approach national agents to help reduce vacancies and bring new occupiers into Leatherhead. The conclusion / recommendation to include proactive occupier/investor liaison (with Centre/agents) to support filling voids and broadening the mix.

With respect to data, measurement & reporting the board discussed that measurement is implied through several strands including a possible baseline residents/occupiers/levy payers survey undertaken at the commencement of the BID with at least an annual survey to provide comparative performance data. Specific initiatives such as online presence can easily be monitored as can wider foot-flow via the counters. Any cost savings made via collective purchasing should be recorded.

6) Sector based data

The question was raised as to how BID funded initiatives should match to all the sectors represented within the levy payers. For retail & hospitality businesses the correlation was more straightforward but for office occupiers the individual benefits of the BID were less obvious. Discussion around recruitment & retention of staff for businesses in a location with a vibrant town centre were considered.

9 Next steps over Summer

9.1) MVDC Cabinet path and immediate submission

Outline proposal: Board confirmed an outline must be submitted to MVDC by Monday 4 August 2025 so it can be included for Cabinet on Tuesday 23 September 2025.

Owner: Consultant (with Chair/Vice-Chair sign-off).

Notes from discussion: Deferring by one Cabinet cycle would “miss the legal deadlines by one day,” so the August submission is essential. The final designed Business Plan will follow in early September to be added to the Cabinet pack.

9.2) Ballot timetable – keep 1st December, mitigate risk now

Position: Maintain ballot close on Monday 1 December 2025 (5pm) to avoid clashing with peak Christmas trade, allowing result on Tuesday 2 December, 28-day standstill to year-end, and a 1 January 2026 go-live if successful.

Immediate action: Consultant to respond to MVDC confirming this preference and proposing a joint accuracy plan (BID + MVDC) up to the 42-day notice.

Owner: Consultant.

Rationale: Elections had floated moving the close date (first 15 Dec, then 5 Dec). The Board’s preference is to hold 1 Dec and de-risk via list accuracy work, not by shifting dates.

9.3) Hereditament list cleanse and summer fieldwork

Context from the meeting: Working list is c. 230 hereditaments; several errors already found (missed entries/incorrect names).

Plan:

August–September: Reconcile the list with MVDC NNDR data; verify contacts/occupiers; and physically check on the ground during September business engagement so the 42-day notice and ballot packs go to the right people.

Owner: Consultant (with support from Board reps) working with MVDC.

Output: Clean list for the 42-day notice, robust records for ballot packs, and a clear audit trail to reduce challenges.

9.4) Finalising levy rules and budget envelope

Levy rules:

Rate: 2% of RV.

Threshold: Exempt below £8,000 RV.

No cap (no maximum bill).

Charities: Exempt below £70,000 RV; liable at 2% if £70,000 RV or above.

Swan Centre: Each separately assessed unit treated the same as street-front premises.

Budget: Work to a £190k p.a. planning figure (within ~£177k–£200k range) until MVDC confirms levy collection fee.

Owner: Consultant to request/confirm MVDC's annual collection charge and update the cashflow (including the £500 legal deduction from the MVDC development loan).

9.5) Programme content to carry into proposal and business plan documents (from Paper 4)

9.5.1) Clean & Attractive Streets

Discussion: Focus on high-visibility cleansing (gum/graffiti) on priority routes/gateways; keep planters/streetscape to a good standard by escalating baseline gaps to MVDC rather than absorbing them.

Conclusion / Recommendation: Commit to a targeted gum/graffiti blitz and a rapid-response mechanism for tagging/fly-posting, delivered over-and-above the MVDC baseline.

9.5.2) Safe & Welcoming Town Centre

Discussion: DISC retail crime intel-sharing seen as a typical, affordable BID tool; pursue only if it fits locally with Police and traders. No permanent security team or specific night-time security, need/cost not justified. Close liaison with MVDC's JET (Joint Enforcement Team) highlighted as a core BID coordinator role.

Conclusion / Recommendation: Evaluate and, if uptake warrants, adopt DISC (pilot/evidence-led), and embed liaison with JET in the coordinator's remit.

9.5.3) Marketing & Promotion

Discussion: Central to competitiveness vs. Dorking/Epsom; "Hello Dorking" cited for weekly business/event focus. Mix of website, social media, and selective print/leaflet; explore Surrey Hills Radio reach. Emphasis on measurement and ensuring all levy payers perceive value. "Shop Local" good; app models (e.g., LoyalFree) seen as costly with limited proven impact.

Conclusion / Recommendation: Include extensive multi-channel marketing for Leatherhead with robust results measurement (clear KPIs and reporting).

9.5.4) Events & Festivals

Discussion: Value of events debated (footfall vs. sales). Duck Race, Halloween, Christmas Festival recognised as important to remind residents and stimulate trade; but events are time/levy-intensive even with sponsorship. Some members reported direct sales from footfall events.

Conclusion / Recommendation: Restart an annual events calendar (incl. signature dates) while balancing footfall and sales outcomes; plan delivery and costs realistically.

9.5.5) Business Support & Development

Discussion: Collective savings (energy/waste) to help SMEs “save back their levy.” Short, targeted training (digital/marketing) to improve everyday trading and online presence; Leret Partnership consultant feedback noted weak digital footprint for the town.

Conclusion / Recommendation: Run collective savings offers + bite-size training (social/Google Business Profile/visual merchandising). Report “savings won” and audit before/after online presence across the town.

9.5.6) Additional Initiatives and Examples

Access & Parking: Explore tactical parking promotions (e.g., selected-day offers / RingGo fee support where applicable) to boost dwell time at peaks, especially Christmas/Winter.

Investment & Vacancies: Make the BID coordinator proactive on place-marketing/investor liaison—track expanding chains and work with national agents to reduce voids and broaden the mix.

Data, Measurement & Reporting: Consider a baseline survey (residents/occupiers/levy payers) at start and annual follow-up; track online presence changes, footfall (via counters), and collective purchasing savings.

9.6) Sector based data

Discussion: Ensure initiatives benefit all sectors paying the levy. For retail/hospitality the link is direct; for office occupiers benefits are more indirect (e.g., recruitment/retention advantages from a vibrant town centre).

Implication: Tailor comms and KPIs by sector (e.g., visitor-facing outcomes for retail/hospitality; workforce/place-quality outcomes for offices) to make value visible to each group. Mahdi Dolati’s paper of ideas to be acknowledged as high-level opportunities for post-ballot feasibility, not specific pre-ballot commitments.

9.7) British BIDs membership and technical support

Decision in principle: Proceed with six-month British BIDs membership (noted at £425 + VAT) once loan funds clear to access ongoing technical guidance through the ballot run-in.

Owner: Chair/Consultant.

9.8) Governance/admin steps through August

D&O insurance: Obtain Hiscox quote and bring back a recommendation.

Owner: Consultant.

Companies House: AP01 forms from all directors to be returned in one batch so the public record reflects the current Board.

Owner: All directors (collate via Consultant/Chair).

VAT & cashflow: VAT registered; reclaim on eligible pre-ballot costs; reflect the £500 legal cost deduction in cashflow and loan schedule.

Owner: Consultant/Treasurer.

9.9) Summer timetable and next meeting

Documents: Circulate a near-final Business Plan draft in late August for Board feedback ahead of the Cabinet deadline.

Meeting: Preference aired for Fri 29 August (10:00, The Stockroom)

Owner: Chair/Consultant to fix date and issue papers.

10.0) Any Other Business (AOB)

Board representation / sector voices:

Note to invite/encourage Zoey (hospitality) to re-engage given sector coverage; Kara has moved on from the Edmund Tylney.

General point to strengthen attendance for the run-in to ballot (without delaying the programme).

10.1) Loan drawdown timing:

Expectation that net funds (£35,000 after £500 legal deduction) would arrive within days; to confirm receipt and update the cashflow as soon as they land.

10.2) Venue

The Board thanked Rachel Groom for hosting the meeting at the Stockroom Society.

Meeting closed at 12:56

Date of next meeting: Friday 29 August (10:00, The Stockroom)

Addendum:

Following the meeting the consultant team updated the gross income estimate based on the current RV list provided by MVDC but accounting for the removal of charity hereditaments with an RV of < £70,000

Location	Total RV £8k+	BID INCOME ALL RV2%	TOTAL RV EXCLUDING Char Relief <£70k RV	BID INCOME EXCLUDING Char Relief <£70k RV
Bridge Street	£ 587,550	£ 11,751	£ 573,550	£ 11,471
High Street	£ 2,640,550	£ 52,811	£ 2,507,050	£ 50,141
Church Street	£ 1,028,100	£ 20,562	£ 919,850	£ 18,397
North Street	£ 971,000	£ 19,420	£ 953,000	£ 19,060
Crescent	£ 900,850	£ 18,017	£ 900,850	£ 18,017
Guildford Road	£ 1,640,200	£ 32,804	£ 1,607,950	£ 32,159
Fairfield	£ 128,450	£ 2,569	£ 128,450	£ 2,569
Bull Hill	£ 1,919,000	£ 38,380	£ 1,866,250	£ 37,325
TOTAL VALUES	£ 9,815,700	£ 196,314	£ 9,456,950	£ 189,139
BID INCOME GENERATION	BID INCOME RV 2%			
ALL PREMISES	£ 196,314			
EXCLUDING Charity Relief <£70k RV	£ 189,139			
Difference	£ (7,175)			

The team also undertook a quick analysis of the business type using the definition listed on the RV list as provided by MVDC which we have not reviewed or cross-checked so needs to be looked at with this caveat in mind.

VO Property Description	No within BiD area	VO Property Description	No within BiD area
BANK AND PREMISES	2	KIOSK AND PREMISES	1
BEAUTY SALON & PREMISES	1	LEISURE CENTRE AND PREMISES	2
BETTING SHOP AND PREMISES	1	LIBRARY AND PREMISES	1
BUSINESS UNIT AND PREMISES	1	OFFICES AND PREMISES	84
CAR PARKING SPACE AND PREMISES	10	PETROL FILLING STATION AND PREMISES	1
COMMUNICATION STATION AND PREMISES	4	PUBLIC HOUSE AND PREMISES	4
COMMUNITY CENTRE AND PREMISES	1	REGISTRARS OFFICES AND PREMISES	1
DAY NURSERY AND PREMISES	1	RESTAURANT AND PREMISES	10
DENTAL SURGERY AND PREMISES	1	SELF CATERING HOLIDAY UNIT & PREMISES	1
FOOTBALL GROUND AND PREMISES	1	SHOP AND PREMISES	73
FUNERAL PARLOUR & PREMISES	1	SORTING OFFICE AND PREMISES	1
GYM AND PREMISES	2	SUPERSTORE AND PREMISES	1
HAIRDRESSING SALON AND PREMISES	3	SURGERY AND PREMISES	4
HOTEL AND PREMISES	1	WORKSHOP AND PREMISES	1
TOTAL UNITS			215