



ARDINGLY PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Clerk: Bernadette Cox
c/o The Post Office, 37 High Street, Ardingly, West Sussex, RH17 6TB
Tel: 01444 226 209 Email: ardinglypc@hotmail.co.uk

Minutes of the Remote Ardingly Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 2nd June 2020 at 7pm on the Microsoft Teams Platform

Present

Councillor D. Stutchbury (Chairman)
Councillor C. Hotblack (Vice Chairman)
Councillor J. Aloof
Councillor P. Burr
Councillor R. Chalk
Councillor B. Gass
Councillor J. Horsman
Councillor J. James
Councillor K. James
Councillor B. Strutton
Councillor G. Taylor

In Attendance Mrs. B Cox (Parish Clerk)
Mrs. H Schofield (RFO)

1569.1 Public Questions

There were twenty members of the public present and the following issues were raised:

A Parishioner (Rowan) wished to express his view of the reduction at the SA25 Showground Site, he welcomed the proposed reduction of 70 dwellings from 100 and would prefer it “go away all together” but also stated that any further reduction would also be welcomed.

Andrew Lambert asked what infrastructure would be enhanced to support the proposed SA25 Development as he felt current infrastructure could not support such a large development. The Chairman explained that the details of the infrastructure to be added would be visible once a planning application was received by MSDC as

currently the DPD is just to allocate the sites for development. The Chairman asked District Councillor Andrew MacNaughton if his understanding was correct. Councillor MacNaughton explained that infrastructure is dealt with at Planning application level but the Parish Council should consider listing the infrastructure they feel is required should the development go ahead. Councillor J. James explained that the SA25 development was an item later on, on the agenda.

Margaret Meldrum raised the issue of the Tennis Courts and the Clerk explained that this issue was to be discussed later on the agenda. Margaret also raised the issue for the reservoir and that she felt there was still an issue around parking as people could not see the yellow lines on West Hill and people swimming in the reservoir. The Clerk explained she would again contact South East Water to see if they intended to take further action.

Fiona Rocks shared her gratitude to Terry Mathews (Local Contractor) who had offered to clean the Village Tennis Courts for free. She also reiterated Margaret's point re the reservoir and suggested the Clerk actually contact the activity centre as she wasn't sure if they police the swimming. She explained that the parking is still an issue as only 70 cars are allowed to park in the car park and then it is closed. Councillor Taylor explained that it was his understanding that South East Water and the Police were patrolling the area advising on social distancing, parking, and swimming.

A Parishioner (Rowan) raised the issue of speeding on College Road and requested that the police be contacted to complete a speed check. The Clerk advised that the Police had recently completed multiple speed checks and had found that overall, the occurrence of drivers speeding was low and felt that the issue on College Road was one of perceived speeding rather than actual speeding.

David Port asked if the Parish Council had received his most recent letter on the Pavilion. The Chairman acknowledged they had and that a Remote Pavilion WP Meeting would be arranged in the coming weeks.

Melanie Stafford raised the issue of speeding on the Showground road heading into the Village, she requested that the Police be contacted to conduct a speed check on this road. The Clerk advised she would contact the PCSO to request this. She then went on to ask if Ardingly had fulfilled its "quota" on development. The Chairman explained that the numbers in the DPD were over and above any "quota" as these were new numbers that MSDC had received from Central Government. Councillor J. James referred to the 1st Consultation in which set out requirements for Ardingly's quota and this suggested that Ardingly had 21 dwellings left to meet their quota, However he confirmed what the Chairman said in that the DPD allocation was outside of this number.

1570	Procedural Matters	
-------------	---------------------------	--

	<p>1570.1 There were no apologies received.</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>1570.2 There were no declarations of interest in respect of any matters on the agenda.</p>	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>1570.3 To confirm and sign the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 5th May 2020</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>Councillor Hotblack challenged the representation of the wording used by the Clerk to outline the purpose of the SA25 Survey at item 1561.1 as he felt that it was different to that of a previous set of APC minutes. The Clerk asked Councillor Hotblack what his concern was specifically as she felt that the wording though slightly different from previous minutes was irrelevant as the purpose remained the same in both sets of minutes. He explained that he wanted to be sure that the Parish Council was not bound by the result of the survey when taking its vote on whether the proposed development at SA25 was "substantial". The Clerk explained that she felt the wording in both sets of minutes contained "inform" meaning that it was clear that the survey was to inform the PC vote and that they were not bound by its results. Councillor K. James that she understood from the Clerk that the PC were not constrained by the Survey results.</p>	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>Councillor Chalk then challenged the Clerk on item 1561.3 She asked the Clerk why the amount in the minutes was stated as £250 when this was not correct and that the Clerk knew this as she had an email conversation about the upper limit being £200 and this conversation resulted in a specific printing process. Councillor Chalk then went on to say that the above being true why had the Clerk overspent on the printing for SA25 as the invoice has come in at £259.00, £59.00 over the agreed budget. The Clerk explained the £250 in the minutes is a typo and should read £200 and that she had not spent over the agreed £200 budget. The RFO explained that she had combined two invoices to the printing company for ease and that the Clerk had not breached the £200 limit for the SA25 Survey. The minutes were amended to read £200 at item 1561.3 and the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 5th May 2020 were duly APPROVED by the Council and the Chairman will sign a copy of the same as a true and accurate record of the proceedings once the government restrictions in place for Covid-19 are lifted</p> <p>1570.4 To confirm and sign the minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council meeting held on the 26th May 2020</p> <p>Councilor J. James raised the Issue that he had asked that his view on an item be reflected in the minutes and Anne Bott who clerked that meeting explained that her minutes due to the confidential nature of the meeting only show the decisions of the Council recorded on that night, the discussion is represented separately in the notes she provided to the Council but these are of course confidential. Councillor J. James accepted this. The minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council meeting held on 26th May 2020 were then duly APPROVED by the Council and the Chairman will sign a copy of the same as a true and accurate record of the proceedings once the government restrictions in place for Covid-19 are lifted.</p>	
1571	<p>Clerks Report</p> <p>1571.1 Members had been supplied with a copy of the Clerks Report prior to the meeting. The contents of the Clerks report were accepted and APPROVED.</p>	
1572	<p>Finance</p> <p>The Chairman raised the issue of the most recent Finance Meeting and accompanying DRAFT minutes. He asked Councillor J. James if they were available as it had been agreed at the last meeting, he would forward these to the Clerk and she would produce a DRAFT. Councillor J. James explained that he had not yet forwarded them to the Clerk but would do it now, he offered his apologies.</p> <p>1572.1 To receive and approve the schedule of payments since the last meeting</p> <p>The RFO reiterated that the previous observation raised with the printing invoices was incorrect and that the invoices were two invoices combined for ease. The SA25 printing was £146.00 plus VAT and the Community Covid Leaflet was £84.00. The RFO explained that the total payments since the last meeting was £8076.38 and this includes the Hapstead Hall grant issued by the PC.</p> <p>Councillor Chalk raised the recent grant that the Hapstead Hall had secured to support them during Covid-19 from MSDC and asked the RFO if this will affect the grant they receive from the PC as they would in effect be receiving a “double payment”. The RFO explained that the PC give £8000.00 to Hapstead Hall every year and the most recent payment is in relation to last year grant. Councillor Chalk explained to the RFO she would like to discuss this newly secured grant further with the RFO.</p> <p>Councillor Chalk then enquired about two further payments, Parish Online and Website, she asked “what are these?”. The RFO explained that the Parish Online is a mapping software that until recently WSCC had paid before but they are no longer doing this. The Website fee is the Domain renewal. Councillor Chalk suggested that the website renewal needs to be looked at as the website is not currently fit for purpose. The RFO explained that there are a number of ways the website needs to be complaint by September so perhaps this could be incorporated into any renewal/review.</p>	

	<p>Councillor Hotblack asked if “we” had, had confirmation if the Toilets were now being cleaned. The Clerk explained that she had confirmed that they are.</p> <p>1572.2 To receive the Finance Report The RFO explained that all key items had already been discussed under agenda item 1572.1 The Finance Report was ACCEPTED and APPROVED.</p> <p>1572.3 To receive the Internal auditors report for the year ending 31st March 2020 The RFO explained that the interim audit was conducted in Dec/Jan and this focused on policies and procedures. She then explained that this most recent audit was conducted remotely and that the auditor had received and reviewed all documentation and had no issues to raise. The contents of the Auditors report were ACCEPTED</p> <p>1572.4 To approve the Annual Governance Statement for the year ending 31st March 2020 The RFO explained that the PC need to be satisfied that they have no issues with the series of statements. The Annual Governance Statement for the year ending 31st March 2020 was ACCEPTED</p> <p>1572.5 To approve the Annual Statement of Accounts and Principal Variances on Previous Year for the year ending 31st March 2020 The RFO explained the statement at page 5/6 had also been reviewed at the recent meeting of the Finance Committee. The Annual Statement of Account and Principal Variances on previous year for the year ending 31st March 2020 was APPROVED</p>	
1573	<p>Planning Committee To consider planning matters as below and any others which may arise in the meantime:</p> <p>Councillor Hotblack asked all Councillors if they had received all previously circulated documents in terms of the planning applications below, it was confirmed they had.</p> <p>1573.1 DM/20/1571 Change of use of squash courts to a cafe with external changes and construction of a mezzanine floor, Ardingly College, College Road Ardingly Haywards Heath The above application was discussed, and a comment of NO OBJECTION was AGREED</p> <p>1573.2 DM/20/1239 Single storey side and rear extension (Corrected site location and block plans received 18.05.2020) 11 Munnion Road Ardingly Haywards Heath West Sussex Councillor Hotblack explained the only change to this application from the previous application is that the location of 11 Munnion Road is now correctly marked on the map of Munnion Road. The above application was discussed, and a comment of NO OBJECTION was AGREED</p> <p>1573.3 DM/20/1569 Installation of six lowerable floodlighting columns and two small associated electrical distribution cubicles at Gibbs Field Ardingly College, College Road Ardingly Haywards Heath Councillor Aloof explained that previously when Flood Lights were installed at the college the application included reference to a timer to preserve the environment for the wildlife, he believed the previous timer was set at 3pm till 9pm during the winter. Councillor K. James suggested she felt such a timer may be appropriate on this application too. Councillor Stutchbury explained that he understood that the floodlights being “lowerable” would mean they would be environmentally friendly. Councillor Hotblack suggested that perhaps this application needed to be discussed directly with the college, however After discussion it was AGREED that a comment of NO OBJECTION would be submitted but with a note requesting that the lighting be placed on a timer between 3pm and 9pm.</p> <p>1573.4 DM/20/1652 Reinstatement of existing access for extraction and planned woodland operations including restitution of forest track way with restored ditches and</p>	

	<p>removal of anti-fly tipping bund at entrance way to Cobb Lane for the access of forestry machinery, Hapstead Wood Cob Lane Ardingly West Sussex This application was discussed, and a comment of NO OBJECTION was AGREED</p>	
1574	<p>Matters requested for inclusion on the agenda at the last meeting 1574.1 To agree a date for members of the Emergency Planning Committee to meet and consider the longer-term effects of Covid-19 and produce a report to be presented to Full Council at the July Meeting It was AGREED the members of the Emergency Planning Committee would meet to consider the above on Tuesday the 9th of June 2020 at 6pm Councillor Chalk also suggested that the Winter Management Plan be reviewed at the same meeting.</p>	
1575	<p>General Matters 1575.1 To receive and discuss the results of the SA25 survey The Clerk shared the results of the SA25 Survey on her desktop for all those attending the meeting online to see, she then read the details of the results through in full (a copy of the results shared is attached to these minutes for reference) Councillor Hotblack read his own personal grouping of the comments received aloud. The Clerk remarked that these seemed very similar to her groupings and explained as is obvious how comments are grouped is subjective as are the comments themselves. Councillor Hotblack explained that what he felt was clear from the comments is that the education of Parishioners re the DPD by both the Parish Council and MSDC was poor. Councillor J. James explained that should Covid-19 restrictions be received prior/during the 2nd Consultation then an Open Day similar to the one held for the 1st Consultation could potentially be held. Councillor J. James said he agreed with Councillor Hotblack as he has read comments such as "I don't want any houses but I know the Council won't want that so I will put x number".</p> <p>Councillor Aloof said he felt the results were clear, as shown in slide 3, where it shows that out of the 364 respondents, 41% did not want any development but 59% wanted some form of development on SA25.</p> <p>Councillor J. James remarked that with statistics there are multiple ways to "cut the numbers" for example he read the results to say that actually 50% say less than 20 houses and the majority of those actually prefer none. Councillor J. James went on to say he feels the results/slides need to be shared with the Parish asap, using Facebook and the Parish Website.</p> <p>Councillor Stutchbury agreed with Councillor J. James on the sharing of the results and suggested that the survey results should also be shared with MSDC and the Inspector as part of the PC response to the 2nd Consultation.</p> <p>Councillor Burr asked that the publication of the results be delayed as he had not seen the slides being shared online currently before this meeting. The Clerk explained that the slides online currently were just a pictorial version of the results received by all Councillors by way of written report from the Clerk almost a week before today's meeting. Councillor J. James suggested he had checked the numbers using the written report against the spreadsheet that accompanied it and there was an error of one but otherwise it all checked out and was correct. Councillor Burr said he did not want the results to be shared until he had compared the results. The Clerk agreed she would forward the slides to all Councillors the following morning (Wednesday), However, the Clerk again explained that these slides did not contain new information but if Councillor Burr insisted delaying sharing the results she would like to minute that they would be shared with the public, Saturday the 6th of June giving Councillor Burr ample time to compare results and still allowing Parishioners access to the results in good time.</p>	

Councillor Hotblack asked the Chairman to consider swapping the order of items 1575.2 and 1575.3 as he felt it was more appropriate to discuss how the Parishioners views would be represented to the 2nd Consultation after a vote had been taken by the PC.

The Clerk challenged this suggestion by Councillor Hotblack and explained she had considered the implications of looking to amend resolutions after the results of a survey had been received and as such had structured the agenda in this order. She also explained that she had circulated the agenda prior to publication and no such request in regard to the ordering of items was made, in short she explained to all present that she did not understand why these two items were being “swapped” and suggested given the significance of the SA25 development and the known contention within the Council on this issue, it was not wise to make any such amendment. She then explained that ultimately the decision is the Chairman’s to consider. It was AGREED that agenda items 1575.2 and 1575.3 be “swapped” and item 1575.3 be actioned before item 1575.2. The Clerk reiterated that she saw no reason for such a “swap” to occur and that the Council were carrying out such an action against her advice.

1575.3 To vote on whether the PC believe that the proposed reduction at SA25 is “substantial”

Councillor Taylor addressed the Council and explained that he felt it pertinent to remind all Councillors of the significance of the vote to be taken, he explained this was not “a throw away vote” and the result of the vote would directly influence the Parish Council response to the 2nd MSDC Consultation. Councillor Taylor outlined a timeline of the actions of the PC thus far in connection with SA25 and the DPD. He also referenced that 89% of the village voted in the survey that the proposed reduction at SA25 was not “substantial” and this should be considered by all Councillors. Councillor Hotblack discussed his view that the reduction from 100 to 30 dwellings was a 30% reduction and that 30% was a “substantial” reduction.

Councillor K. James agreed that whilst objectively a 30% reduction could be considered “substantial” for the PC to vote that the proposed reduction at SA25 is “substantial” when they were in the possession of the knowledge that 89% of the Parishioners who responded felt it was not would be reckless.

Councillor Stutchbury explained that regardless of the results of the vote the survey result would be sent to the Inspector as part pf the 2nd Consultation process.

***Councillor Horsman joined the meeting at this point**

Councillor Stutchbury suggested that the PC should be mindful that the proposed reduction was achieved by the PC with the support of the AONB, who now believe the revised site at SA25 is no longer a “Major” development, so the PC would not have their support in any further communications in terms of a further reduction.

Councillor Gass suggested that although the Survey results were not binding, that to vote that the proposed reduction at SA25 is “substantial” when 89% of those Parishioners who responded feel it is not would be to fail the Parish.

Councillor J. James stated that he believes that a response to the inspector along the lines of the village would like “X” number of houses would not be heard and that the only way to impact the size of SA25 would be to create a substantial argument against the SA25 development using MSDC Policy, NPPF and seeking further support from the AONB.

Councillor Stutchbury agreed with Councillor J. James and stated that he believed they were on the same page in that the inspector would be provided with all further relevant information and that the SA25 WP would create a draft response for Full Council approval to be sent to the Inspector.

Councillor J. James agreed with the suggestion that the SA25 WP should create a draft response to the 2nd Consultation but he explained he was trying to demonstrate that if the PC votes and shares that the proposed reduction is substantial and then shares the results of the village survey all that will be heard is that the PC approve of the proposed reductions at SA25.

Councillor Taylor suggested that all Councillors were given the opportunity to make their personal views heard during the survey process as were all Parishioners and that any vote taken now should be made having been informed by said survey and with a view to representing the Parish as is the responsibility of a Parish Council.

Councillor Chalk raised the point that out of 730 surveys only 364 responses were received, which meant only appx 50% of the village actually responded. She suggested that the comments received on the survey demonstrate that a large number of Parishioners who responded were uninformed. She also stated that the 30% proposed reduction at SA25 already achieved was good and she failed to see what further movement could be made on this. She discussed how it had already been raised that any figures received as part of the survey process were subjective and as the Scrutiny Committee had already approved the proposed reduction it was likely that it would be accepted by the Inspector.

Andrew MacNaughton (District Councillor) explained that the AONB's main argument was that 100 dwellings at SA25 was a "Major" development and since the proposed reduction reducing the dwellings at SA25 from 100 to 70 that the AONB did not believe the SA25 development to be "Major" and that this figure of 70 was agreed as not "Major" using Handcross as the example.

Councillor J. James again said that the only way any further reduction of SA25 can be achieved is by using policies, NPPF guidelines and substantive argument to reduce the number of dwellings and that any attempt of "Can we have "X" houses?" would not be heard.

Councillor Hotblack suggested that even if the Parish Council voted that it felt it was a substantial reduction this did not mean that the results of the vote needed to be communicated as part of the 2nd Consultation and that the PC could just communicate the Parishioner views.

Councillor J. James responded to Councillor Hotblack and suggested that this is not a statistical exercise and that the village feel it was not substantial.

He then went on to explain that since the beginning of the DPD process members of the Council have attempted to disrupt any action by the Parish Council on SA25 starting with the village Open Day.

The Chairman interrupted Councillor J. James and advised him that his comments were not appropriate. Councillor J. James asked that he be allowed to finish his comment and went on to say that members of the Council attempted to block a vote on the 7th of January in connection with SA25, the Chairman abruptly told Councillor J. James to "stop now". Councillor J. James challenged that his comments were relevant and that if he be allowed to finish them the Chairman would see that. The Chairman abruptly shut down Councillor J. James and refused to allow him to speak on this matter further.

A vote was then taken and it was **RESOLVED** via roll call vote of all Councillors (7/4) that Ardingly Parish Council believe that the proposed reduction at SA25 is substantial.

Councillor Taylor remarked that he was disappointed but not surprised as he could have called the voting lines prior to the meeting.

1575.2 To discuss the need to amend the resolution agreed at the EO Meeting of the Parish Council on the 26th February 2020 to include a “third option” as follows: “To approve that should the PC vote that the proposed reduction at SA25 is not “Substantial” and the SA25 survey shows a majority of Parishioners have indicated a preference for housing at SA25 that the PC seek, as part of their response to the 2nd consultation to achieve an agreed further reduction in the number of houses at SA25, whilst also communicating as part of that response that if the requested reduction is not achieved the PC will seek to remove SA25 from the DPD.”

The Clerk explained that this agenda item had fallen due to the wording within the item, which is why she advised that this item not be discussed after the vote. There was discussion as to whether this item could/should be amended and the Chairman asked Anne Bott (SSALC) who was observing on the call her opinion, Anne Bott confirmed the above agenda item had now fallen and that the members of the Parish Council needed to move forward on this as the continued discussion could appear as though members were attempting to change the agenda for questionable reasons. The Clerk remarked this was the exact reason why she had advised that the agenda not be amended in the first place.

1575.4 To agree how the PC’s will produce their draft response to the 2nd MSDC Consultation of the DPD for approval by Full Council

After brief discussion it was **AGREED** that the SA25 WP with support of the Clerk will discuss how the Parish Council will respond to the 2nd MSDC Consultation and provide recommendations to the Parish Council

1575.5 To receive an update from Councillor Stutchbury and Councillor Horsman on their meeting with Richard Speller from Highways

Councillor Horsman gave a brief outline on items that were discussed at the meeting with Richard Speller from Highways, which included but were not limited to, Traffic/SID data, Speeding, Bus Stop Markings in the High Street, 40MPH speed limit leaving the village past Wakehurst, parking near fellows bakery. Key points to note were that Highways will attend to remark the Bus Stop in the Highstreet, That RS advised Councillor Horsman to report online his concerns with the speed limit leaving the village and an officer from highways would attend and access this and RS had advised that the Council look to project manage the parking by fellows themselves as they do not require a planning application and if they wait for highways the project will be significantly delayed. The Clerk explained that she emailed the person RS recommended to project manage this but had not yet heard back.

1575.6 To approve the construction of a structure at the allotments (plot 9) appx 3.5m wide and 2m high

The above structure was discussed and it was noted that it does not contravene the lease, the Parish Council had **NO OBJECTION** but suggested that the Clerk liaise with Ardingly College as the landowners to ensure they approve of the structure.

1575.7 To discuss and approve one of the circulated quotes for the cleaning of the Tennis Courts

The Clerk gave details of both quotes received for the cleaning of the Tennis Courts, Proline quoted £900 and Colourworks quoted £1320.00. After discussion the Parish Council felt that reopening the courts was an urgent works in the current climate and that Proline could attend at an earlier date, there fore the quote of £900 provided by proline was **APPROVED**

Councillor J. James asked why the offer from a local contactor to clean the courts for free was not being discussed/accepted. Councillor Chalk explained that there are minor repairs to the surface

	<p>of the courts that Proline will undertake as part of the cleaning process that a non-Tennis Court Contractor would not be able to do.</p> <p>1575.8 To agree the provisional date for the reopening of the Tennis Courts It was AGREED that the Clerk would liaise with Proline and ascertain when the courts would be ready to reopen and feedback to the Parish Council</p> <p>1575.9 To discuss and approve the quote for the risk assessment of the relevant Parish Council assets with regards to legionella risk The Clerk explained that Valens Water who provided the quote to the Parish Council was recommended by SSALC and that this was a Risk assessment that the Council have to complete for compliance. The quote of £330 to complete the Risk Assessment and accompanying training was APPROVED</p>	
1576	<p>Matters of public urgent importance or for future inclusion on agenda Councillor Taylor raised the issue of the Parish Council Website and explained that currently it is not secure and that he will need to take it offline to look into this. It was AGREED that he do this asap and that any temporary loss of the website be communicated using the Village Facebook Page. Councillor Chalk asked that Councillor Taylor as part of communicating with the Website Hosts on the above issue discuss and review what is currently be provided.</p>	
1577	<p>Future Meeting Dates 1577.1 Parish Council meeting 7th July 2020 at 7pm</p>	