

# **EASTERGATE PARISH COUNCIL**

**2nd April, 2015**

## **At a Meeting held at Eastergate Parish Hall**

### **PRESENT**

(Chairman) Mr C Allington, Mrs L Ballard, Mr P Cramp, Mrs H Kilroy,

District Councillor Mr J Charles and 1 parishioner were in attendance

Apologies were received from Mr R Sparrow, County Councillor Mr D Whittington, District Councillors Mrs J Goad and Mr D Maconachie.

### **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

73. None.

### **MINUTES**

74. **Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 5th March 2015, having been circulated, be taken as read and approved as a correct record, and be signed by the Chairman.

### **COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS REPORT**

75. Councillor J Charles advised members that following ADC having served an order upon Tesco's relating to the state of the Barnham Bridge Inn, that hoarding had now been erected. Adjoining property was understood to remain in the ownership of the brewery and an Order was being sought to tidy up the area and to ensure that it was safe. An appeal against the refusal of ADC to allow an application at the Fontwell Avenue Yard was referred to and had been refused. Mention was made as to a £50,000 Defra fund.

### **PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT**

76. Members were advised of a number of applications, including one for uv reactors at the waterworks in Fontwell Avenue and the demolition and rebuilding of a barn at Northfields Farm Cottages. An appeal against the notice to demolish a garage in Elm Grove was referred to. The occupier was continuing to build the structure. There was no update in relation to the Design Guide to accompany the Neighbourhood Plan. Reference was made to the Community Infrastructure Meeting which was attended by the Chairman. It was suggested that ADC were late with developing their CIL Scheme. A 25% payment would come to the parish council from local development with a charging rate of £250 per sq. m for residences in inner areas and £100 PSM for the towns of Bognor and Littlehampton. However the proposed BEW development would attract only £50 PSM. Members considered a draft response to the consultation received. And it was felt that the scheme should be de-coupled from the Local Plan.

77. **Resolved 1:** That there be no objection to the reported applications

78. **Resolved 2:** That the Chairman's response be agreed and adopted, and delivered to ADC

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

79. The Clerk circulated files of correspondence and referred to the items therein. Members considered a "Mutiny" Festival to be held at Fontwell Park racecourse. The racecourse holds a licence up to 23.00 but the organisers may apply for an extension. The lack of consultation with the public was a concern. An approach from the racecourse management to the council had not been recognised as being in regard to this issue and may have been part of the racecourse efforts to fulfil obligations of consultation required by the licence. Members discussed ways to take the matter forward.
80. **Resolved 1:** That the racecourse management be asked to invite affected residents to meetings to share a noise management plan with them.
81. **Resolved 2:** That the council's letter be delivered to ADC Licensing Department

## **ANNUAL PARISH ASSEMBLY 2015**

82. Members were reminded that the Assembly is to take place on the 28<sup>th</sup> May.

## **PARISH HALL**

83. The AirS village hall advisory service was referred to as they would be receiving £1,000 less in grants than the cost of the service, from 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2015. The Clerk reported speaking with the manufacturers of the damaged chairs and had put the council's views that the chairs supplied were not fit for purpose and should be returned with a requirement for a refund and/or the purchase of alternative chairs with an appropriate weight limit on them. Members considered that an approach should be made to Trading Standards to seek the evidence needed to support any legal claim as to breach of the Sale of Goods Act. A third quote for refurbishment of the toilets was awaited.. The shutters had been re-wired and there was to be an electrical inspection next week. Members discussed the use of the spotlights and were advised that they had been disconnected some time ago. It was considered appropriate to ask the hall committee to consider repairing or re-connecting the lights. The hall curtains were considered to be very dusty.
84. **Resolved 1:** That the Chairman and Clerk contact Trading Standards
85. **Resolved 2:** That the issues regarding spotlights and curtains be referred to the Hall Committee

## **SPORTSFIELD**

86. Members were informed of a letter received from the developers regarding the boundary issue. An Architects plan was referred to. The boundary appeared to be shown by a red line and the distance from the red line to the new fencing was the area of land owned by the developers. The distance from the line, being the middle of the boundary hedge, inwards was the councils' land. Further discussions would take place to try and resolve the issue. The Clerk referred members to the outstanding play area repairs and the new contractors had failed to undertake the work. The Clerk had asked the previous contractor to press on with the repairs and to also deal with any other issues arising since the previous instructions were given. The matter of choosing a new bin for the play area was considered to be a matter for the new council.
87. **Resolved 1:** That the choice of a new bin be an agenda item for the July meeting
88. **Resolved 2:** That the Clerk's actions regarding play area repairs be approved

### **FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

89. The Clerk had circulated the statements for March by e-mail and at the meeting. The Clerk informed members that his new study to hold the councils' property was now ready but would require the movement of the telephone/internet line to that room. Quotes had been obtained varying with the length of the contract to be entered into.
90. **Resolved 1:** That the financial statements be approved and payments be authorised.
91. **Resolved 2:** That the Clerk arrange movement of the telephone line on a 2 year contract.

### **RISK ASSESSMENT REVIEW**

92. Members were advised that the review, which was nearly concluded, had not be found. In the absence of Mr Donabie, the matter would be dealt with at the July meeting.
93. **Resolved:** That the item be placed upon the agenda for the July meeting.

### **WAR MEMORIAL**

94. Members were advised as to the receipt of a third quotation for the purpose of seeking funding. The application for funding had been made to JDAC through K Roberts of ADC.

### **REPORT OF MEETINGS OF OUTSIDE BODIES**

95. A meeting arranged by the developers of the Dandora proposal for development had been attended. It was considered to be a clinical presentation but with little helpful response to questions asked. The provision of a shuttle bus from the development to the Barnham railway station twice a day was put forward as a transport solution. Questions that were not answered were given a stock "the council is dealing with that" answer. Concern was expressed as to there being only one point of access to and egress from the estate, and proposed changes to the roundabout were also troubling.

### **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

96. None.

### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

97. None.

### **OPEN FORUM**

98. Members were advised that a school crossing had been voted for.

### **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

99. **Resolved:** The date of the next meeting will be 28th May 2015.

Signed : ..... Dated : .....

**PART II**

100. **Resolved:** That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting on the grounds that their presence may be prejudicial to discussion of business to be considered.

**MINUTES**

101. **Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting held on the 5th March 2015 having been circulated, be taken as read and be approved as a true record and be signed by the Chairman.

**MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

102. None.

**LOCAL PLAN CONSULTANT**

103. Members were advised that the Clerk had not taken further steps to instruct a new consultant as, if the LP was rejected by the Inspector and subsequently amended then a consultant would likely be needed. However, if the LP proceeded as submitted, then the councils' representations would not be amended and it might be possible to instruct a barrister to represent the council at the EiP direct. Members considered that Aldingbourne council should be advised that no fees have been incurred to date following refund by the consultants.

104. **Resolved:** That the Clerk inform Aldingbourne PC of the fee situation.

**ANY OTHER URGENT MATTERS**

105. None.

Signed : ..... Dated : .....