



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 7th July 2020 at 6pm 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)

1578.1 Public Questions

The following issues were raised by a member of the public:

A Parishioner asked that the Parish Council explain the outcome of the vote taken at the June PC Meeting on SA25. The Parishioner explained that the role of the Parish Council is to “represent the views of its Parishioners” and she felt this was not done. The Chairman explained there was an agenda item where this concern would be addressed. She then went on to say that thanks should be given to Councillor K. James and the Headmaster of St Peters Primary School for the support they had given to those families most in need during the pandemic and she noted that this support was planned to continue through the Summer school break.

1579	<p>Procedural Matters</p> <p>1579.1 Apologies were received from District Councillor Gary Marsh</p> <p>1579.2 There were no declarations of interest in respect of any matters on the agenda.</p> <p>1579.3 To confirm and sign the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 2nd June 2020</p> <p>Councillor Chalk raised the issue of the DRAFT Finance Minutes not yet being completed the Clerk explained she had received the notes from Councillor J. James but had not yet completed these DRAFT minutes. Councillor Chalk then stated that she would still like to discuss further with the RFO the recent grant received by Hapstead Hall. Councillor Chalk also stated that she would like the PC to consider the review of the "IT set up" of the Council. For reference the third item raised by Councillor Chalk does not relate to the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on the 2nd June 2020. The minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 2nd June 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>	
1580	<p>Clerks Report</p> <p>1580.1 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>	
1581	<p>Finance</p> <p>1581.1 To receive and approve the schedule of payments since the last meeting</p> <p>The RFO explained that the total payments since the last meeting were 1742.18 and this includes the 1st Yearly Payment of two to the Public Loans board for Hapstead Hall.</p> <p>Councillor Chalk asked the RFO how many payments remain on this loan and the RFO explained the PC is halfway through the loan and there are appx 13 years left with two payments a year, one in June and one in December.</p> <p>The RFO explained there were a number of invoices to be added to the Online banking system for payment and she would do this on the 8th July this includes payments to HR services, West Sussex, Legionella Contractor, and the May Pavilion Cleaning.</p> <p>1581.2 To receive the Finance Report</p> <p>The RFO explained the key points to note in the report were that the 2nd precept payment had been received. That the Village Voice has not had a lot of income. The Recreation outgoings are not significant for this time of year as the gross invoices have not been submitted by the contractor yet. The admin is over budget due to the use of external services and the PC has yet to receive the MSDC invoice for the waste freighter.</p> <p>1581.3 To agree another signatory for all bank accounts</p> <p>The RFO explained that due to the resignation of Councillor Aloof the bank accounts now only have three signatories and ideally this should be four. Therefore, the PC need to approve a fourth signatory. It was APPROVED by unanimous vote that Councillor K. James would be placed on the bank account as the fourth signatory.</p> <p>1581.4 To agree that when the current One Year Bond held with Hampshire Trust matures in August the funds will be reinvested in a similar bond for a further year</p> <p>The RFO explained that the Hampshire Trust one-year bond is due to mature and that current rates are not great; her advice is to reinvest the funds in a similar bond and then review next year. It was APPROVED by unanimous vote that the funds be reinvested into a similar one-year bond as advised.</p>	

1582	<p>Planning Committee</p> <p>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>1582.1 DM/20/1947 Part demolition of existing rear extension, proposed two storey rear extension and one and a half height side extension, together with internal and external alterations, The Knapp 64 College Road Ardingly Haywards Heath</p> <p>The above 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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>Councillor Chalk also suggested that the Winter Management Plan be reviewed at the same meeting.</p>	
1583	<p>General Matters</p> <p>1583.1 To receive a brief from the identified contractor on the proposed Street Lane Parking works</p> <p>The Clerk explained the contractor had informed her he was unable to attend the meeting and had provided here with a verbal brief which the Clerk summarised for the Councillors. The key points to note were as follows:</p> <p>The contractor has estimated a time of 2/3 weeks to complete the works. The contractor has given two pricing options.</p> <p>Option 1 is priced at £37,102 including VAT</p> <p>Option 2 is priced at £39,090 including VAT</p> <p>The quotes are broken down as follows:</p> <p>Option 1</p> <p>Plant Hire £2,272.40</p> <p>Soil removal "Muck away" £11,350</p> <p>Drop Kerbs £1610</p> <p>Retained Kerbs £920</p> <p>Terram £184.00</p> <p>Type 1 (60 tonne) £2277</p>	

Labour (4 men) £9890

Plastic Ground Guard £3,415

The remainder is VAT

Option 2 is as above, however instead of the Plastic Ground Guard, Grass Crete at a cost of £4238 would be used.

The Clerk advised the PC has £18,920.80 S106 local community infrastructure contributions available to be used for parking provisions within Ardingly Village Centre. The RFO advised the shortfall would come out of general reserves as these works had not been budgeted for and it should be noted that the Pavilion refurb may also need a top up from general reserves.

After discussion the Parish Council RESOLVED that the Clerk obtain two comparison quotes for the works. They Parish Council also asked that the Clerk clarify the following with the contractor:

If a survey on the tree roots or a check for TPO's on the trees needs to be done before they commit to the works

If either the Grass Crete or Plastic Ground Guard lasts longer than the other

1583.2 To agree a formal response to all Parishioners in reference to the decision made on SA25 at the 2nd June Parish Council Meeting

Councillor Taylor addressed the Full Council stating that he felt the wording of this response was quite important and referenced that the survey results shared at the June PC meeting showed that 89% of the village felt that the proposed reduction at SA25 from 70 to 100 was not substantial. He asked for clarification on whether this was to be represented as the village view or the position of the PC in the PC response to the 2nd MSDC consultation. Councillor Stutchbury responded by saying that the survey results would be represented in the PC response to the 2nd consultation as the village view.

Councillor Taylor expressed concern that the PC vote taken at the June meeting reflected that the PC are happy with the proposed reduction and that the response to the 2nd consultation should demonstrate that the village view and Parish Council view are aligned and the recent vote does not suggest this. Councillor J. James agreed with Councillor Taylor and suggested that the response to the 2nd consultation must show that the PC position is aligned with the village view. Councillor Stutchbury stated that the PC would send a response to the 2nd consultation that includes the survey results, the village view and the PC representations.

Councillor Burr asked if the PC could vote on the letter. Councillor K. James asked if the wording in the letter had been discussed before by the SA25 WP and Councillor Stutchbury suggested that they had a letter but it did not go out. The Clerk reminded Councillor Stutchbury that the letter he referred to was not approved by Full Council and as such was not distributed to the Parish.

Councillor Taylor requested that a vote be taken on his suggested amendments to the document namely that the wording should show that the village view that the proposed reduction at SA25 is not substantial will be reflected as the PC position in the response to the 2nd MSDC consultation.

The Parish Council voted on the suggested amendments to the document namely that the wording should show that the village view that the proposed reduction at SA25 is not substantial will be reflected as the PC position in the response to the 2nd MSDC consultation.

The vote was 5/4 against accepting the amendments.

Councillor Taylor asked that the details of which Councillors voted for/against this motion be recorded for public record. At his request the Councillors voted for this motion as follows:

Councillors, Hotblack, K. James, J. James, and Taylor voted for.

Councillors, Stutchbury, Burr, Chalk, Horsman and Strutton voted against.

The Parish Council then voted on approving the document in its original DRAFT form. The document was APPROVED with 1 abstain.

1583.3 To review, discuss and approve the DRAFT recommended Parish Council response to the MSDC 2nd Consultation proposed by the SA25 Working Party

Councillor Hotblack asked if Councillors had read his report circulated prior to the meeting, all Councillors indicated they had. Councillor Hotblack explained the SA25 WP had received lots of advice from Claire Tester at the AONB on what “carries weight” and what doesn’t in terms of the PC response to the 2nd consultation. Overall, her message was to focus on whether the DPD is legal/sound in terms of planning policy.

Councillor K. James asked if there had been confirmation of the 2nd consultation dates. Councillor MacNaughton explained that the Full Council will be reviewing the DPD in July and then it depends on when the inspector can hear it as to when the consultation can be but he estimated Aug/Sept.

Councillor Stutchbury clarified that MSDC Full Council are reviewing the DPD on the 22nd July and that the PC should send a letter to the Full Council prior to this review.

During discussion the PC agreed that creating the DRAFT version of this letter to MSDC be delegated to the SA25 WP and then the final draft be agreed by the full PC via email.

Councillor Horsman asked if this was necessary as the non SA25 WP Members on the Council were not as engaged to be able to vote on the response. Councillor Chalk responded that there was no reason why all members wouldn’t vote on the letter and that it was best practice.

To PC voted that the SA25 WP should create the DRAFT letter to MSDC and it be formally approved by email vote. This was unanimously APPROVED.

1583.4 To discuss the Parish Council need for a maintenance employee

The Clerk explained that she felt that the PC should consider a maintenance employee for general maintenance in the village.

Councillor Stutchbury explained that an employee is challenging as the PC is then responsible for, equipment, insurance etc.

Councillor K. James stated that she felt that Councillor Stutchbury and the Clerk were both right in that an employee is challenging but the village do need a maintenance person.

There was a lengthy discussion on how this issue could be resolved and it was felt that research into a contractor on a retained contract or a “find and fix it” model would perhaps be better suited to the PC’s needs.

	<p>The Clerk explained she would need a job description/role remit to approach contractors and gain quotes for this type of service.</p> <p>It was AGREED that Councillor K. James and Councillor Chalk would liaise about a list of responsibilities for such role and Councillor Chalk asked that the Clerk provide herself and Councillor K. James with a copy of the asset register to support this.</p> <p>1583.5 To agree a recruitment panel to consider the recruitment for the RFO position</p> <p>Councillor Chalk asked the Clerk if she had a hard copy of the RFO Job Description, she explained she was unsure but the RFO explained she did have a copy of the Job Description for the recruitment panel. After discussion the Parish Council APPROVED the members of the recruitment panel for the RFO role were as follows: Councillor Chalk, Councillor K. James and Councillor J. James. It was agreed this recruitment process needed to be under way asap as the current RFO's planned leaving date is the end of September.</p>	
<p>1584</p>	<p>Governance</p> <p>1584.1 To Consider Co Option to fill the vacancies on the Council</p> <p>Councillor Stutchbury explained he felt that there had been emails going backwards and forwards on process and that until the process could be confirmed that the Co Option be deferred until September.</p> <p>Councillor Taylor challenged this and suggested that the Clerk's advice had been clear and there was no uncertainty on correct process. Councillor Stutchbury suggested that the Clerk's advice went against other advice received by the Council. Councillor J. James explained that the Clerk's advice was clear the Co Option vote should be show of hands as per Local Government Act 1972. Therefore, there is no reason to defer the Co Option.</p> <p>Councillor Chalk echoed Councillor Stutchbury's comments around deferring the Co Option process. Councillor K. James explained she was unhappy with the show of hands but she accepts the Clerk's advice on this matter.</p> <p>The Clerk asked Councillor Stutchbury what other advice he and Councillor Chalk were referring to and he explained he and Councillor Chalk had received an email from the monitoring officer at MSDC.</p> <p>The Clerk asked why this has not been shared prior to the meeting and why she was not given the opportunity to clarify this with the monitoring officer. Councillor Taylor and Councillor J. James asked that the email be shared using the share desktop sharing facility, Councillor Stutchbury explained he did not have the email. Councillor Chalk explained she did but had only received it as the meeting began and this was why it was not shared before.</p> <p>Councillor J. James asked Councillor Chalk when she contacted the monitoring officer, she suggested this was prior to the Clerk sharing her advice on the matter. Councillor Chalk then shared the email, the Clerk asked for the full email chain as the one email Councillor Chalk shared did not give context around the advice. The Clerk explained she was very confused as this was not the advice given to her by the monitoring officer.</p> <p>After discussion the Parish Council took a vote to defer the Co Option until the advice given by the monitoring officer at MSDC had been clarified.</p> <p>It was APPROVED 6/3 that the Co Option be deferred until the advice received by Councillor Chalk from the monitoring officer at MSDC could be clarified.</p>	

1585	Matters of public urgent importance or for future inclusion on agenda	
1586	Future Meeting Dates 1586.1 Parish Council Meeting 1 st September 2020 @ 7pm	