

**MINUTES OF THE FULL PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON
MONDAY 8th SEPTEMBER 2014 AT 7.30 PM IN THE STEYNING CENTRE**

“The Council, members of the public and the press may record/film/photograph this meeting when the public and the press are not lawfully excluded. Any member of the public who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed, recorded or photographed should advise the Clerk (in advance,) who will instruct that they are not to be included in the process.”

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR:

1. Q – *‘Is there nothing you can do to prevent these constant attacks on your reputation and the negative effect on your reputations. It is time for a letter to go out to all residents telling them what is happening. It is time for democracy to be returned to Steyning and to honour the mandate from the Town Poll to build a skatepark for the young people.*

A – Cllr Howell responded that we live in a democracy and people have the right to challenge what we do. Whether I believe this is excessive or vexatious or not people still have the right to do this. I hope their own conscience will let them decide whether they are going over the top. The Council cannot comment on any articles written on a facebook or social media site.

2. Q – *Can you tell me whether PC has started the rectification process for the whole of the Village Green on MPF? And assuming it has, do you expect that to be complete this year.*

A – Parish Council has decided to endeavour to rectify the Village Green status. We are seeking legal advice and this will be looked at by Counsel. We hope this will be done quickly, but the legal system is slow.

Q – Until such time as this process is completed will the Parish Council be managing the whole of the MPF as one Village Green, and make sure the Village Green rules apply.

A – That is our objective and it is right that we do this. Now that we are aware of the law and status it is our obligation to ensure that those rules are applied. The key is free and unfettered access, especially with regard to 3 clubs who have facilities on MPF. What has happened in the past and what we are now obliged to do are unfortunately two different things. In 1974 the Chairman of Steyning PC agreed to register the Village Green. We could not find any discussion or vote or agreement to this in minutes, but it has been done and we acknowledge this. This Parish Council, because we have now been told MPF is a registered Village Green are responsible for ensuring these rules are complied with. We feel it is right that Village Green status is rectified.

3. Q – If this is the case, does this mean that the Play equip must be removed, does it mean access for everyone to the bowling green, does it mean anything to be done to any buildings cannot be done. Does it mean the young people are being denied access to this field. I think this is disgraceful.
 A – A Bouncy Castle, if available for all to use, it would be OK. If it's for a private function the answer is no. This is where we get into what is correct and what is reasonable. Parish Council's in the past has tried to be reasonable about what is granted on MPF. We now know there is Village Green status and we have to be careful what we do. We did not want it but this is what we have to work with. It should be unfettered access 24/7. To commit our clubs to this would, I personally think, be unreasonable but this is what the law says. This is why we want rectification. If someone decides they do not like something we could be in trouble. We cannot carry on with letting some rules go but taking up others.
4. Q – Since 1974 it has had Village Green status, people have used it without any problem. All of a sudden this is a problem. People have played cricket and football without any problem. I don't understand this. I am not a pro skatepark person but I walk there every day. At 6.00 in morning it is a beautiful open green space. I cannot understand why after 30 years you are going to try and change it.
 A – I understand and share you concern. Not until Village Green was put on top half were we aware and understood the consequences of the action in 1974. Now we are aware we are obliged to deal with it appropriately. With all the problems that are now evolving it is proper that we get it rectified.
 It will not affect the site, we believe that MPF should be used for sport and recreation in perpetuity. Top half became a Village Green in 2013.
 Q – If the top half has not been a problem why is the lower half now a problem.
 We want MPF to stay as it is.
 A - What with nothing else going on, without a skatepark, with the cricket pavilion falling down.
 When the Cricket pavilion needs repairing the ground would have to be disturbed and we can't allow that to happen.
 Q - This is not true of the cricket club, the foundations would not have to be disturbed.
 A – We have taken legal advice on this and we believe the best thing to do is rectify that status. We do not want to destroy the MPF, it is of benefit to all of us.
5. Q – Village Green status has stopped a skatepark, but allows a Cricket Club to fence off an area which restricts the access for 8 months of the year. There must be one rule for the whole of the MPF and I want cricket and a skatepark.
 Q – We all know clearly why the FoMPF decided to put on Village Green status and that is to stop a skatepark. When are we going to see this put back as an open space so that we can build a skatepark.
 A – We are progressing a course of action to rectify this status. What we do afterwards is another issue.
6. Q – Could the Parish Council inform the residents on how many FOI requests and emails in last month in relation to previous to the application for a skatepark, and how does this affect other work. *Could something be put on the website i.e. Mr.A 3 requests, Mr. B 5 requests, Mr. C 103 requests.*
 A - I will report back on this later.

7. Q – We have heard a lot about democracy. I went to F & C committee, Playing Fields committee, H & L committee. Not one supporter of the MPF skatepark went to those meetings. In November 2013 the plan was for a skatepark of a design with access for the disabled, that plan no longer exists so the vote is no longer valid. Five of the council have not been elected by the residents of Steyning. The man pushing this skatepark through has not been elected. Will the chairman who has not been elected stand down and let an elected member take this role .
A – The residents of Steyning elected the Parish Council four years ago. The structure enables those elected representatives to elect others onto the parish council.

If you have a problem with me you can write into HDC about the process and I am sure they will answer.

Cllr Barling made a statement:

I have been quiet on the subject of the skatepark since I became a County Councillor. I don't want to talk about skatepark but about democracy. This is a small council staffed by 1.5 people and a lot of volunteers who give up their time. Because of one policy the members of this council have been vilified, harassed, complained about and repeatedly subjected to these excessive FOI requests and questions and it is not right. When I started I inherited this proposal. We held a public meeting. Most knew I had reservations about proceeding with a skatepark. I realised there were people who were uncomfortable with it. Then there was a game changer, a complete stranger started complaining to HDC about the conduct of the councillors as a whole and me in particular. I have been subjected to emails headed deceit. I have recently been accused of misleading the Finance committee on the Walks for All project. There are no winners in this, the losers here are the children of Steyning who will not have a skatepark. The residents of Steyning are also losers as we have had to protect ourselves from legal proceedings. We can't get people to come forward as councillors because they know they will be intimidated and it must stop now.

I conclude about the spirit of Steyning. We give out prizes for the good people of Steyning who do good service. The spirit is those people who do service, gardening, sweeping and they all do it. Our Chairman is not a coward nor the Vice Chairman. We are decent people who are volunteers and unless you wish to smash this council stop this tonight.

Cllr Hopkinson commented briefly that all Councillors are elected even if indirectly.

Written questions received from members of the public:

8. Q - A written question was received' *referring to a press statement of 28th August, asking what amendment had been made to the skateboard facility planning application that that would reduce noise*'.
A - The Chairman advised that there had been no mention of an amendment in the press release which is self explanatory and can be viewed on our website.

9. *1) Why did the Council leave it to HDC to get in 2014 the proper legal advice about the village green which the Council could and should have got in August 2012 when the village green extension application was under way?*

A - Following advice from HDC we sought independent legal advice on rectification of the Village Green. The Council sought legal advice on the VG management issues in February 2013.

- 2) How much has the Council spent since August 2012 in legal and other fees on the skatepark project and related matters, including the JR of its subsequently reversed decision to introduce car parking?*

A - So far the council has spent £4,050 on two sound reports, approx. £1,000 on legal advice fees (full figure not available as not invoiced yet) and £148 on the planning application. The costs of the 2JR's were met by the insurance company.

- 3) How many hours does the Council estimate the Clerk to have spent on the project and related matters during this time and at what cost - adopting the council's previous method of calculation?*

A - Hours spent on the actual skate-park itself, planning etc. cannot be quantified but under normal circumstances would have been within the capabilities of the clerk's day-to-day administrative duties. However, this was not normal circumstances and the council received over 200 pieces of correspondence and requests for information on the skate-park from a small number of individuals in the town and this meant an exceptional amount of additional workload for the clerk. This has been calculated at over 268 hours (excluding councillors time at meetings etc.) at £25 an hour at a 'notional' cost of £6,700 or over 7 full working weeks. Unfortunately, these requests, received primarily from one single protect group, continue with 26 received since 1st August this year and we now consider this to be vexatious and manifestly unreasonable and is overwhelming the Council.

- 4) How much does the council expect to spend in legal and other fees and in notional clerk's costs to achieve "rectification" of the village green status?*

A – Any legal costs will come under 'legal privilege'. However, the Council has agreed to get 'advice' on the rectification and dependent on that advice will decide whether to pursue it or, not.

- 5) In the light of this history does the Council still think it wise to ignore the expert predictions that the facility will be too noisy and likely to be closed under noise abatement legislation?'*

A - The council has not ignored expert predictions it has followed all the advice of its qualified experts and those of HDC. As the planning application has been withdrawn for the present time there is no necessity to respond to theoretical questions. Should the skate-park be re-visited in the future we feel sure that the council will continue to take all its experts' advice into consideration.

Question from the floor:

10. Q – There is a strong disagreement in the Town about the skatepark. There decent people on both sides of the debate. I am pro the skatepark. I wonder if the Council would like to join me in asking Mr. Paul Campbell, who many believe is the architect of many of these long and aggressive emails (I am not saying you are but many believe it), to invite you to talk about this and whether he is proud of what he has achieved.

A - Questions should be tabled for the council to answer not individuals. It would not be appropriate for us to join with this.

11. Q – I am concerned that you see Village Green status as a threat and if you remove Village Green status you would be able to have a skatepark and if all these had gone ahead you wouldn't have a Village Green at all I wonder is it safe in your hands.

A – Why is there no car park now because the Parish Council felt it was inappropriate and purchased the land to prevent this happening. I was not around for the scout hut so I cannot answer this. We are still protecting the green open space. The application has been withdrawn.

MINUTES

PRESENT: Cllr Bowell, Lloyd, Rogers, Barling, Alexander, Ness-Collins, Toms, Marshall, Toomey, Staines, Muncey, Hopkinson, Muggridge.
65 Members of the public
Cllr Cockman – HDC
Paul Conroy – Neighbourhood Warden
The clerk was in attendance.

1. **APOLOGIES** – were received and accepted from Cllr Trundle .
2. **DECLARATIONS** – No declarations of interest were received from Councillors.
3. **MINUTES**
 - 3.1 It was **proposed** by Cllr Bowell and **seconded** by Cllr Ness-Collins that the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 14th July 2014 be signed as a correct record of the meeting. **Agreed.**
 - 3.2 It was **proposed** by Cllr Bowell and **seconded** by Cllr Alexander that the minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of 11th August 2014 be signed as a correct record of the meeting. **Agreed.**
 - 3.3 It was **proposed** by Cllr Bowell and **seconded** by Cllr Toms that the minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of 19th August 2014 be signed as a correct record of the meeting. **Agreed.**
4. **MATTERS ARISING AND ACTIONS** – none for this meeting.
5. **POLICE / NEIGHBOURHOOD WARDEN SCHEME REPORT / LAT REPORT**
 - 5.1 To receive the Neighbourhood Wardens report. These are attached to these minutes.

Q - The report says you acted as intermediaries in neighbour disputes in Kings Barn Lane. Can you report why you were involved in this.

A - There had been a neighbours row. Neighbours will call us on some occasions and we will try and settle the dispute and this has always been within our remit. Tom Slaughter's report will be attached to minutes and on website.

LAT has met, things were under control no problems reported so no actions proposed.

6. SKATEBOARD FACILITY UPDATE – To receive an update on current status.

6.1 The Chairman read a letter received from Tom Crowley, Chief Executive of Horsham District Council regarding the skateboard facility application. Attached to minutes.

6.2 The Chairman confirmed the status of the skateboard facility application as contained in our press statement and on the website.

At an Extraordinary Confidential meeting on 19th August the Council Resolved: Owing to advice, only recently received from Horsham district Council, that due to the village Green status, Steyning Parish Council is unable, at this present time, to deliver Skateboard facilities in the Memorial Playing Field to the young people of Steyning and therefore is, regrettably, withdrawing its planning application. The Parish Council is of the opinion that the Village Green was improperly registered. Having due regard to all other users of the Memorial Playing Field and, for their future benefit, the Parish Council will now seek legal advice to rectify the Village Green status on the MPF.

Rectification for the whole of the MPF Village Green is being considered for the following reasons:

- The FoMPF is maintaining that the Village Green (VG) registered by them in 2013 was for “the benefit of those residents who live in the area immediately adjacent to the green “(those people whose houses back on to the MPF or, live close by), although the council has assurances from WSCC that this is not the case. The MPF is a valuable asset bought for the whole community, for the use of the whole community for recreational and sports purposes and the council wishes to ensure that it is enjoyed in perpetuity, without let or hindrance by any self-interest group, by people within the whole of the administrative district of Steyning parish.
- VG status, whether the 2013 registration or the 1974 registration, means that all parts of the VG must have ‘unfettered’ (unrestricted) access at all times and for this reason the skate-park planning application has reluctantly been withdrawn. Unrestricted access has the potential to cause issues for the sports clubs and the council is bound, as landlords, to uphold the law.
- VG status means that the existing clubs can ‘maintain’ their premises but would not be able to extend or re-build them. The tennis club has already had to shelve plans for a new clubhouse. It also limits what clubs can do to increase their income as any hiring of the clubhouses for social activities, other than those linked to the clubs’ sports activities is unlawful. This will clearly reduce the clubs’ abilities to bring in additional income.
- The VG status means that the council is limited to what it can do with the MPF for the benefit of the whole community i.e; to allow occasional parking on the green; to allow other activities such as private weddings/parties etc. that may restrict access; to allow marquees to be erected for a function/event/festival that restrict access.

I am not going to talk about the alternative Leisure Centre site for a skatepark as in the opinion of the Council this will never be given building permission.

The council, your council, is run by unpaid hard-working volunteers who put in long hours to make the community safe, secure, vibrant and a friendly

environment in which to work and live and visit. The campaign against the skatepark, the orchestrated campaign of harassment and intimidation against the council as a corporate body, and individual councillors has been unprecedented and has overshadowed the other valuable work that the council has done on your behalf.

Perhaps, this is a time for reflection when the protest campaigners should stand back and cease this campaign which achieves no purpose other than cost the council and, you the council tax payers – we had to impose an 18% increase in the precept this year because of this –additional costs for legal and other advice as well as tying up our administrative resources which prevents other projects being carried out. The 26 Freedom of Information requests and other requests received by the council over just the last month are an indication of the focus that a small number of local residents are putting into overwhelming the council. I do not believe this is right, reasonable or acting in the best interests of the town as a whole.

The council applauds anyone who is interested in how the town is run, but deluging the council with FOI and other requests to the level that is being experienced has gone beyond ‘reasonableness’ and is now ‘vexatious’ and ‘manifestly unreasonable’. The council is being forced to a standstill and is finding it increasingly difficult to function in the best interests of the community. I hope now that in the interests of the community the campaigners will take this opportunity to cease their excessive requests for information and questions and allow the council to get on with serving the community.

7. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

7.1 Composition of the Steering Group

There appears to be no formal rule on the composition or make up of the Steering Group or the Focus Groups. We have taken advice from HDC and they have said – *“Where a cluster has been formed we would encourage the steering group to have a fair representation to ensure all parishes have an equal voice. It is up to the parishes though to decide who to appoint and it is a local decision as to who should decide membership, roles, responsibilities etc.”*

It is proposed that the Steering Group will comprise 16 members – 4 from each parish – with 2 being Parish Councillors and 2 members of the community as required with skills and expertise to offer to the group. The Steering Group members have not yet been appointed and roles are yet to be decided. We are at the very first stage.

Q – Regarding the number of representatives on the Steering group you said four from each parish is the recommendation. This is of concern. With the greatest respect to them Ashurst and Wiston are much smaller than Steyning. Could this cause problems/issue given the sizes of parishes. How will this be decided.

A – This is, as I understand it, a recommendation from the consultants as to how this is normally done. The steering group will decide the numbers. We will decide who our representatives on the Steering group should be. This issue can be raised.

Q – This is a recommendation. This is a decision making process and it worries me.

A – There is to be a Terms of Reference.

The final decision is the referendum which is a measure of populations. Discussions will be equal discussions. This process will not take 5 minutes and councils will change next May. There should maybe be more proportional representation, simply because of land availability etc.

Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area

The Neighbourhood Plan area will be the total area of land within the four parishes. The proposed designated area has been advertised by Horsham District Council for six weeks and no observations or objections were received. We are now waiting for it to be formally agreed although it has been recommended by the officer for approval. Unfortunately, we are not able to receive grant monies from HDC until the area has been designated, when the first 50% will be paid.

Status of funding

We heard on 19th August that we have been successful in securing a grant of £7000 from Locality. The work detailed within our application as being required and relating to the grant must be completed by 31st December 2014. The grant monies from HDC totalling £19,800 have also been secured subject to the Designated Area being agreed. These grant monies include a 'clustering bonus' of £3300.

Status of relationship with AirS

We have not yet formally appointed AirS but will do so as soon as grant monies have been received. At the present time, AirS are working on a goodwill basis, on the understanding that they are the chosen consultants for the four parishes. We will be signing terms with AirS as soon as funds are in place. AirS have confirmed that their fees to act as consultants for all four parishes will be £26,900 plus Vat.

Key dates and targets

We are yet to discuss the Timeline for the Neighbourhood Plan with the consultants. There are certain works to be completed before Christmas in order to secure grant funding and it is likely that there will be a Public Meeting organised during November.

Focus Groups

At this stage, we have not agreed the number or nature of the Focus Groups required. We will need to take advice from the consultants. An example of the groups which may be formed are as follows –

- a. Economic/Business
- b. Transport/Accessibility
- c. Community
- d. Environmental,
- e. Heritage/Local Knowledge
- f. Housing

Potential members of the Focus Groups have not yet been approached. We will be calling upon the knowledge, experience and expertise from residents in all four parishes. Each Focus Group will be reporting back to the Steering Group.

Public Survey/Questionnaire

As part of the consultation process, it will be necessary for a Public Survey to be put together and circulated at an early stage. The format and content of this survey is yet to be discussed.

- 7.2** Councillors discussed which two members should join the Steering Committee of the Neighbourhood Plan cluster. Two councillors volunteered Cllr Toomey and Muggridge. Cllr Toomey and Cllr Muggridge spoke briefly about why they wish to volunteer. Cllr Howell **proposed** Cllr Toomey and Cllr Lloyd **seconded. Agreed.** Cllr Howell **proposed** Cllr Muggridge and Cllr Rogers **seconded. Agreed.** Would it be sensible to have a deputy. Cllr Muncey volunteered for this role. It will be asked of the Steering group if this is appropriate. Cllr Howell **proposed**, Cllr Rogers **seconded** for Cllr Muncey to deputise. **Agreed** if required.
- 7.3** The first meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will take place on 10th September 2014.
- 7.4** Bramber Parish Council will hold grant funding that is received by any of the four Council's involved and keep a record of income and expenditure incurred by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Committee.

8. COMMITTEE MINUTES, REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1** **Playing Fields** – Minutes of 22nd July, 26th August and 2nd September 2014. Cllr Ness-Collins **proposed** and Cllr Marshall **seconded** agreement to and adoption of the minutes and accounts and expenditure for the period. **Agreed.**
- 8.2** **Planning** – Minutes of 22nd July, 5th and 19th August, 2nd September. Still amending and adding to Conservation document but it is now in final stages. It will be forwarded to HDC for approval. We are undertaking this in order to have more input into alterations and additions to building in the conservation area. If you find properties in the conservation area that may not have requirements we expect of them, would we write to them to advise them. We could only do this via HDC. Cllr Alexander **proposed** and Cllr Toms **seconded** agreement to and adoption of the minutes. **Agreed.**
- 8.3** **Highways and Lighting** – Minutes of 26th August 2014. Monitoring High Street toilets and these are much improved. Clean and no smells. Bins full on Friday but rang contractor and they were emptied. Cast iron bin in the High Street has been stolen. This theft has been reported to police but would be grateful for any information. Have we asked police to look at CCTV. The clerk will check up. We have applied for Operation Watershed funds for Dog Lane We received a proposal from the Visitor and Tourism group for brown tourist sign on by-pass. This will go to WSCC for costing. Food and Drink festival got off to a great start. Cllr Alexander **proposed** and Cllr Muncey **seconded** agreement to and adoption of the minutes and accounts and expenditure for the period. **Agreed.**
- 8.4** **Finance and Community** – Minutes of 5th August and 2nd September 2014. **5th August** – we received presentation about Walks for All footpath along the Riverside from Bramber, some discussion about this being in Bramber. Total cost £50k and committee agreed to support the sum£7.5k from Section 106 transport fund subject to confirmation that this could be used in a neighbouring parish. New Boiler for the Steyning Centre to be installed at the end of month.

2nd September

We discussed FOI's.

Cllr Toms reported that the 3rd September Film Night which the Council ran was excellent, good turnout, sold 92 tickets and profit for the Steyning Centre of £98.75. Next film, Love Punch 1st October tickets £6 including tea and coffee.

Table top sale to be held on 27th September 10.00 -3.00. £8 per table.

Spoke about investments of £50,000 and decided to split into smaller accounts, if possible, but not many societies will take parish councils.

Cllr Lloyd reported that the Visitor and Tourism Group have provided a breakdown of costs for the Walks for All project and stated that phase 1 would cost £50K.

They currently hold £25K and donations of £7,500 from three Parish Councils will bring the total held to £47.5K.

Walks for all further clarification will be reported at the next meeting.

Visitor & Tourism group have looked at other funding.

The path, when built, who will be responsible for maintenance. Cllr Barling will explain more in his report.

Cllr Lloyd **proposed** and Cllr Rogers **seconded** agreement to and adoption of the minutes and accounts, expenditure and payments for the period. **Agreed.**

9. COMMUNITY ASSET REGISTER

9.1 To receive a motion from Cllr Barling 'That the Parish Council applies to HDC to register Steyning Police Station as a Community Asset under the Localism Act 2011'.

This puts a moratorium on any proposals of a sale for 6 months to find money to buy it.

Sports clubs might like to club together for this purpose.

Q - Thought police needed the money from the site. Would this cause difficulties by putting a block on their selling it.

A - It is not a block, it provides 6 months for Parish Council to be given opportunity to buy it first.

It would be worth a lot for development. The purchase price would be market price. May never be achieved.

Cllr Alexander would not like to see the building altered in any way. Built in 1860 and should be preserved.

Q - Can other buildings be registered.

A lot of other buildings could be registered.

Cllr Barling **proposed** the motion as above, **seconded** by Cllr Rogers. **Agreed.**

10. TRAINING FOR COUNCILLORS

10.1 **To discuss and agree cost for training for Councillors to be provided by SALC/Hedley's.**

The clerk has requested a visit from the ICO's advisory service but this advisory service deals mainly with Data Protection Act advice although there is some cross over to Freedom of Information. The Clerk has also sought advice from SALC and they will visit and produce a training/advice session for all councillors on Freedom of Information and related legal issues. The cost for all councillors would not exceed £500.

Q - Could we involve other parishes to reduce cost?

Cllr Howell **proposed, seconded** by Cllr Ness-Collins for the clerk to arrange this training and to include other parishes if possible. **Agreed.**

11. REPORTS FROM DISTRICT AND COUNTY COUNCILLORS

Cllr Rogers, Horsham District Council:

The Leisure Centre, HDC Wellbeing have opened a Health and well-being hub. Appointments can be made over any health and well-being issues with advisors. Event on Loneliness and Isolation is being held tomorrow. Great support, 55 replies. Janice Leeming, Debbie Wood and Emma Edwards to give presentations. Hope as many councillors who can come will attend.

Cllr Cockman, Horsham District Council:

Cllr Rogers talked about the issue of representatives on NP. Do we make this decision before the Steering group is formed?.

Before lampposts were changed some had warnings about dog fouling. Will these be replaced?. Cllr Barling to check.

One function of District is Scrutiny. This council was invited to send items for the working groups in scrutiny. I will bring a list of items for inspection and concern. Q - Can HDC when they next sweep/clean the roads, give us a plan, and then co-ordinate with WSCC to empty gulleys? The drains may then have a chance of coping with flooding.

Cllr Barling, West Sussex County Council:

Underpass under the river is work going well.

Walks for All, is primarily targeted at the Disabled and Mothers with prams. At the H & L meeting and meetings in Upper Beeding and Bramber, all supported making monies available out of Section 106 money. Not Parish Council money. It is held at HDC but for use and agreement by WSCC. Parish Council's are consulted for their support. All were asked for £7.5k each. However, we may not need this now. V & T have now achieved a grant from SDNP and have found some other funding opportunities from WSCC.

Operation watershed Dog Lane going forward for approval.

Mouse Lane there have been some road works there.

Cllr Alexander drew up a scheme for alleviating some flooding which may be viable. To put in for some Operation Watershed funding for this.

Church Street is marked for patching but I am pursuing for it to be re-surfaced.

Newham Lane, at the top end my attention has been drawn to speed of cars. We will take this to H & L for discussion.

Bramber High Street works to start on 1st October.

Film Society have put into the CLC for a grant for a Water Boiler here at the Steyning Centre.

Cllr Toms said the stream by Star choked up and needs clearing.

A - This is a tributary to River Adur and responsibility of Environment Agency. The clerk to contact.

12. ITEMS FOR PRESS RELEASE

Q - Cllr Barling has said no prospect of skatepark being built. I would hate this to be reported in press and wish this to be clarified.

When the skatepark is built, all the demonising, scaremongering and fears of noise of hooliganism will be a passed wonder with the enjoyment of a free skatepark for all ages of youth.

A - Our position as of now is that we have withdrawn planning permission, that is all. This is Cllr Barling's personal opinion not opinion of the council.

have not discussed or debated this at Council. The council has voted on two items: one to withdraw planning and tow to seek counsel's opinion on rectification of the Village Green.

13. INFORMATION

- 13.1** Councillors agreed that they would like to offer the Head Teacher of Steyning Grammar School their congratulations for excellent exam results. Cllr Bowell proposed, seconded by Cllr Muncey for the Clerk to write.
- 13.2** Greg Charman, Community Safety Officer, HDC has asked for volunteers to join the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme, further details available from HDC.
- 13.3** The Chairman has been copied in on a letter sent by a resident to the Chief Executive of HDC. The letter stated that the Parish Council has been subjected to unfair treatment, that HDC had not supported the project, that the planning process appears to be in disarray. The writer also stated that it appeared the young people of Steyning would not get a skatepark and that many people felt let down by the council and that fewer people would come forward to become Parish Councillors as they could not fulfil their role.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 7.30pm 13th October 2014

The meeting closed at 9.22 p.m.

Signed: Date: 13th October 2014
Chairman