



Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held in The Kirdford Village Hall, Kirdford on Monday, 15th February, 2016 commencing at 7.00 p.m.

Present: Cllr. Mr. I. Campbell (in the Chair)
Cllr. Mrs. K. Fenney
Cllr. Mrs. A. Gillett
Cllr. Mrs. N. Goddard
Cllr. Miss S. Pinder
Cllr. Mr. J. Ransley (also District Councillor)

224. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** – Apologies for absence had been received from Cllr. Mrs. L. Nutting (holiday), Cllr. Mrs. J. Robertson (personal reasons) and Cllr. Mrs. J. Duncton, County Councillor.
225. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** – To receive and note questions, comments or representations. There were no members of the public present.
226. **DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST** – to receive disclosures of personal and prejudicial interests from Councillors on matters to be considered at the meeting. There were no declarations of interest from Members.
227. **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** – to resolve that the minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 18th January, 2016 be signed as a correct record.

The minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on the 18th January, 2016 were a correct record of the proceedings thereat. The minutes were then duly signed by the Chairman.

228. **TO ADOPT THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEES :-**
- (a) **Planning Committee Minutes** held on the 25th January, 2016. These were duly **AODPTED.**
229. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS.** The Chairman reminded Members of the need to comply with legislation requirements.
230. **AIRCRAFT NOISE**
- (a) **Update on Arrivals Review.** The Chairman explained that he had met with Mr. Peter Drummond last week and been advised that the Arrivals Review was now published. Generally speaking this was good news for this area as there was to be a wider arrivals swathe, increased to 8 to 14 nautical miles where as currently it was narrow. It recommended that the A.320’s ‘whine’ should be resolved, so these had to be modified. The report recommended raising the height from 7,000 ft to 8,000 ft and potentially moving stacks out to sea rather than over Sussex. When the wind was in the West but drops to no wind (e.g., in the evening) they

would shift to Westerly arrivals, so even when the wind was in the West there was a likelihood there would be more noise in order to give people in the East more relief. There was a fair chance that this would be implemented quickly as the planned Judicial Review was on hold pending the outcome of the Arrivals Review. Gatwick had said that it had narrowed the swathe to within existing limits so it was not an airspace change. Gatwick does not want the judges to determine which airspace could be used. There was a stay of execution pending on the Arrivals Review and how much is expected and implemented. They were pressing for a Departures Review as well. The Chairman would circulate the full report that he had received this afternoon from Mr. Drummond to all Members.

- (b) **Consideration of proposal to join the new local grouping & retain informal membership of CAGNE.** At the last meeting Mr. Drummond had made a presentation and he was now asking the Parish Council to agree to joining the new group (The Association of Parish Councils Aviation Group) in principle, but still continuing the Parish Council's informal arrangement with CAGNE. The Chairman felt that in his opinion the Council could not definitely decide as it had not yet seen the terms of reference or protocols; he had in fact received these just prior to this meeting. Therefore, these would be distributed to Members and a final decision could be made next month.

Cllr. Mrs. Gillett felt it would be a good idea to join providing it did not cost a lot of money and occupy too many hours. The Chairman reminded Members that Mr. Drummond would be this Council's representative. He explained that in the terms of reference there was a differential between two kinds of membership: Full Membership where pay a subscription or Associate where do not. The subscription rate should be ascertained before next month.

Cllr. Mr. Ransley was concerned that there could end up with so many small groups and your views get lost. He did not necessarily think that CAGNE represented this area needs best, but at the same time they had been successful.

All Members were happy to agree in principle to joining The Association of Parish Councils Aviation Group, but agree the final details next month.

231. **REPORTS FROM COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS.**

Cllr. Mr. Ransley (District Councillor) advised that CDC had agreed to grant to this Council in relation to the provision of additional play equipment at School Court.

Regarding the Ward boundary changes that was going on, the issue was about changing the number of councillors from 48 to 36 which implies that this Ward would change from next election and include Wisborough Green, Kirdford, Ebernoe and North Chapel. The Panel would meet tomorrow. The criteria was about numbers and geographically about who uses the same shops, facilities, etc. Consultation had gone out and responses from Parishes would be taken into account. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett felt that this Parish was linked very strongly with Plaistow and Ifold because of the school, church, pre-school, same Parish Magazine, etc. She did not think there were any links with North Chapel. She considered it important to respond to this consultation. Cllr.

Mr. Ransley pointed out that it was possible to change a Parish boundary. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett would write a response.

At the last Council meeting the issue of Members' allowances came up; every four years an independent panel makes recommendations; this year it made recommendations, but the Leader decided to change them. The recommendation was that the Chairmanship allowance be marginally increased for inflation for Overview and Scrutiny as it had a large workload so proposed that would be increased and Planning and other Committee Chairmen would get less; but no, it was decided that was wrong and the Deputy Leader needed to have and increase because of the workload. He was extremely concerned that people were making arbitrary decisions and putting decisions aside. The Council carried the motion.

The Charging Infrastructure Levy had been approved so any new development would have to pay £200 per sq. m towards infrastructure and this Parish would get 25% for any development in this Parish. This charge would be included for extensions over a certain size.

The new Supplementary Planning Guidance was bringing out new rules on affordable housing, numbers and the A.27. This was guidance that would support policies in the Local Plan. The obligations and affordable housing would come down to viability.

CDC was to out-source all its leisure centres, so costs were likely to increase.

Cllr. Mrs. Duncton (County Councillor) had sent her apologies but had supplied the following report which was read to the meeting by the Chairman :-

The Full Council would not meet until Friday, 19th February but it was pretty certain now that a vote would be taken on a Council Tax increase of 3.95%. As she had said before this had an element of 2% ring fenced for care in later life.

On the upside having been about the hardest hit County in the recent RSG it now, after a lot of pressure, had received another £6.2 million. This was gratefully received but of course did not fully cover what had been lost.

Another good thing was that Operation Watershed was back to the tune of half a million pounds and although not at all sure yet she thought the Cabinet was looking at putting a bit more in that pot. Operation Watershed was very successful and she personally welcomed it back. Obviously there had been staff and team changes from those the Parish Council worked with before, but the system would be worked the same way. The County will inform Clerks fully when it had the teams in place. This must be good news.

A long debate at County was expected on the budget but having sat through sessions and as an onlooker at Cabinet she personally was satisfied that it had the right priorities and would see them through.

Just as a reminder these are: (1) Young people, (2) The economy and (3) Later life. At this moment in time she was not sure that it was continuing with the Members Big Society Fund.

She did not think this affected Kirdford Parish but in Petworth she managed to get some healthy lump sums for Coultershaw Beam Pump and Petworth Real Tennis. Just as an update on her activities as your County Councillor. She is Vice-Chairman of Rights of Way and Children and Young People Services Select Committee and sits on several Panels and task and finish groups. One Panel is Corporate Parenting, the second one is Member Development and at different times task and finish groups of which Highway Improvements she chaired. This one is now with the Cabinet member for Transport and Highways for his approval or not of course. Her main occupation was deputy Cabinet member to Residents Services which as she had told the Parish includes West Sussex Fire and Rescue. It also covers community issues and Trading Standards. She represents her Cabinet member on the joint Blue Light collaboration committee in Reigate between the Sussex and Surrey Police, South East England Ambulance, West Sussex Fire and Rescue, East Sussex Fire and Rescue and Surrey Fire and Rescue.

Quite a lot of fingers in pies but she enjoyed it and hopefully she contributed to the benefit of all. Of course you win some you lose some but on the whole constructive.

The next CLC was in Fernhurst on 21st March. There was still a small pot of money if any local organization was looking for some help.

232. **CORRESPONDENCE** :-

- (a) **WSSC Community Support Teams Consultation and Future Partnership Working** – WSSC as part of the Community Green Offer was looking with and support local communities who are interested in shaping the way some local services are delivered. Providing support for those actively participating in a range of locally identified enhancements/initiatives with training, equipment and limited funding. If the Parish Council was interested in getting involved were asked to complete the expression of interest section of the online form. A survey needed completing.
- (a) **Chichester District Council Recycling** – Mr. Barrow had been invited to a number of Parish Council meetings, including the Annual Parish Meeting, but unfortunately was not available on any of these dates. Mr. Barrow should be asked to provide a copy of this presentation.

233. **DOCUMENTS FOR COUNCILLORS TO READ** :-

- (a) Glasdon Brochures re: Gateways and Bins, Bollards, etc. Available in Parish Office.
- (b) Wicksteed Playgrounds New Year Offers. Available in Parish Office.

234. **PROJECTS/PRIORITIES** - to receive reports and updates on last month's actions – all as per portfolio.

Drainage - The Chairman advised that he had met with Landbuild who were scheduling the work for June. Letters would be written to landowners to obtain their consent for

access, etc. The Environment Agency had now issued a license, but it imposed new conditions which resulted in price increases; now the silt had to be removed from site and disposed of (wet silt was contaminated waste) and the crash barriers have to be removed. Fortunately, the works could still be undertaken within the Watershed funds. One statement in the Landbuild quotation was that the river bed had to be dry, but this had been clarified and meant at a low level.

WSCC was being chased with regard to the outstanding works on ditches, etc., and Mr. Sykes was coming to see him. Other outstanding works were the responsibility of landowners, so had chased these and stressed the importance of maintenance.

A letter had been written to the Environment Agency reference the dissatisfaction of their statement that they did not maintain the River Kird. They had responded advising that this was the responsibility of the landowners and supplied a copy of the information they had sent to the landowners. It was still not known what they had done to make sure that the landowners fulfilled their responsibilities. This would be followed up.

Resilience Plan – Cllr. Miss Pinder advised that this was progressing and she continued to work on it.

235. **UP-DATE BUTTS COMMON WATER LEAK AND APPROVAL FOR PAYMENT OF CONTRACTOR'S COSTS.** Cllr. Mrs. Gillett presented the background paper as follows :-

“Proposal to settle an account from Ashley Burns of Borettec Water Ltd for the repair of the water leak beneath the play equipment on Butts Common”

On 18th September 2015 Mr. Rob Brading of Southern Water Ltd, the CDC Environmental Health Officer, the Parish Clerk, Cllr. Mrs. Nutting and a parishioner (Mr Frank Ilston) met on Butts Common to discuss the worsening water leak which was seriously damaging the play equipment belonging to Kirdford Parish Council. A National Trust representative was invited but was unable to attend. Mr. Brading informed the meeting that all the pipes running beneath the Common were private pipes and therefore Southern Water were not responsible for investigating nor repairing the water leak. It was also determined that neither CDC nor the National Trust had any responsibility for the situation either.

Therefore, in October 2015 Mr. Ashley Burns was approached for advice about possible sources of the water leak as he had previously carried out some work on private pipes running across the common. Mr. Burns was extremely helpful and offered his advice which was that he believed that the source of the leak was a redundant pipe relating to a previous supply going to Herons Farm. Mr. Burns offered to investigate this possibility but found it very difficult to contact the owner of Herons Farm. He visited the Common and the farm on four occasions and told Cllr. Mrs. Nutting that he would not charge for the time as he was passing through Kirdford on another matter.

Mr. Burns was also in discussion with Mr Brading of Southern Water. These discussions continued and Cllr. Mrs. Nutting was told at that time that it would not be

possible to investigate or repair the leak by digging beneath the common because there was so much water there that any trenches would fill up with water and pumping equipment would be needed. This would cost in excess of £2,000 and would require permission from the National Trust.

Mr. Burns then decided that he might be able to investigate the leak by digging an exploratory hole at the edge of the Foresters' car park. He told Cllr. Mrs. Nutting he might be able to do this on Saturday, 14th December. He did not mention a fee for the work but left her a message to say that, on digging two exploratory holes on that day he had discovered a leaking pipe and capped it off. He did this work without providing Cllr. Mrs. Nutting with a prior estimate of the cost and without authorization of the work on that day.

Cllr. Mrs. Nutting was now in receipt of an invoice for £825 to cover the cost of the work undertaken.

Cllr. Mrs. Nutting understood that both Mr. Brading and Mr. Burns were of the opinion that the repair had succeeded in stopping the water leak but it would be some time before there was any improvement in the state of the ground around the play equipment. She had emailed Mr. Brading to confirm this opinion but had had no reply to date.

Cllr. Mrs. Nutting proposed that the Parish Council should pay this invoice as the work was undertaken with the best of intentions by a small local contractor whose goodwill in investigating the problem was not being questioned. As Mr. Burns submitted the invoice on 18th January, 2016 for work undertaken on 14th December, 2015 Cllr. Mrs. Nutting requested that the Council resolves to settle this account immediately.

The water leak had resulted in the closure of the play area and the state of the ground in the vicinity of the play equipment had become an eyesore in the centre of the village. There had also been the loss of a much used parish amenity with ongoing Health and Safety issues. Several children had got stuck in the mud there and a child's shoe was lost. These problems have been causing disquiet in the village since the leak was first noticed on 14th July, 2015.

Although the Parish Council is not directly responsible for the water leak it is responsible for the maintenance of the play equipment and for the safe use of the amenities which it provides. There have been no alternative solutions brought forward for solving the problem described.”

Cllr. Mr. Ransley asked why the supply had not been turned off at the connection in the street? He was informed that unfortunately Southern Water did not know whose pipe it was and it was not one that now had meters at the roadside. Cllr. Mr. Ransley stated that if it was an old pipe from Herons Farm, could they not contribute towards the costs incurred. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett pointed out that it could not be proved that it was coming from Herons Farm. Cllr. Mr. Ransley suggested making the payment and justify this on the basis that Butts Common was a community asset and the exceptional circumstances. The Chairman pointed out that in fact it was not known that those works had fixed the problem; it was still very wet and was not dryer. £600 of the £825 was in relation to materials (parts) and he considered it important that the Council ascertain

what materials/parts were required as this seemed an excessive amount to cap off a pipe. The gentleman had said he would investigate and did the hole for free. He had tried to telephone Cllr. Mrs. Nutting to get authority but had not been able to contact her so he went ahead without authority. The bill was for filling in the hole (as he said he would dig it for free) and capping the pipe. It was important for him to justify his bill. This was not Parish Council land and the pipe was not the Council's problem so could be accused of spending rate payers' money on things that were not to do with the Council. Cllr. Mr. Ransley stated that he was not aware of those facts, therefore he retracted his earlier comments.

Cllr. Mrs. Gillett felt that the Council should pay this bill because he had had to hire equipment; there was a need to do this as a good will gesture. She considered that the Water Board should take some responsibility as they had made no effort to find out who was responsible for the leak. The Chairman considered that the only justification to pay this was he was a local person that the Council may wish to use again, so perhaps could pay something and then release the remainder when the Council had evidence that the problem had been cured.

The Clerk advised the meeting that this transaction went against both the Council's Standing Orders and Financial Regulations.

Cllr. Mrs. Gillett felt some of this should be paid and Cllr. Miss Pinder suggested £500. However, Cllr. Mr. Ransey pointed out that by paying some of the bill the Council would be acknowledging that it gave him a contract. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett considered that Southern Water should contribute as it had a responsibility to ensure owners stop water leaks. It was in the centre of the village and was a major health and safety issue. Cllr. Mr. Ransley stated that Mr. Burns had not been authorized by this Council to do the work. He did not think that this should be paid until Mr. Burns had responded to the request for justification of the bill. It was **RESOLVED** :-

That dependent on the receipt of a detailed explanation of the make-up of the bill, it was agreed in principle to make a payment of up to £825; the Clerk was delegated in association with Cllr. Mrs. Nutting and the Chairman to make a decision to pay subject to being totally satisfied that the payment was justified and that the leak had been fixed.

236. **UP-DATE ON CROUCHLAND.**

(a) **Approval of contribution to costs.** Cllr. Mr. Campbell explained the following:-

Amount paid to-date :-

Contributions to consultant's costs	£ 5,375.00
Promised capped funds towards legal costs 4.2.16	£ 5,000.00
	<hr/>
	£10,375.00
	=====

Outstanding requests :-

20th October, 2014 – asked for contribution towards expenditure of £2,500; the Parish Council decided

that it would contribute 25% up to £750.00 towards this.	
No invoice has ever been received.	£ 750.00
Invoice outstanding for 50% of Birketts invoices 428790 and 441554	£1,375.00
	<u>£2,125.00</u>
	=====

It was therefore recommended that a further contribution be sent to Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council to cover the outstanding requests. At the Finance Committee Meeting held on the 7th October, 2015 it was agreed : "There was likely to be additional expenditure in relation to Crouchland in the order of £3,500, but some should be kept in reserve."

It was therefore recommended that a further payment needed to be made towards the outstanding requests.

Cllr. Mr. Ransley asked if Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council kept this Council appraised, which the Chairman confirmed. He then asked if it was known how much they had raised so far and the Chairman stated it was in the region of £50,000; including £5,000 from each Parish Council, £5,000 from Plaistow Village Trust and £15,000 from an unknown charity; the public appeal had raised about £20,000. This may not be enough as there could be a need to use Stephen Tromans at the Public Inquiry. The Chairman confirmed that Wisborough Green Parish Council had contributed and Loxwood Parish Council had promised something. Cllr. Mr. Ransley was personally reluctant; he was very supportive of consultants costs and legal costs seeking advice, but not to funding representation at hearings as both WSCC and CDC would have QCs making representation. CDC would make a good case as it was them that was being criticized. The Chairman explained that Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council and Kirdford Parish Council had commissioned via Birketts had commissioned an AD expert to give advice on the AD plant and he was producing good evidence. There was to be a meeting with WSCC and CDC this week. WSCC recommended approval of the Lawful Development Certificate because the applicant said they did not need to use the stanchions to export the gas whereas the expert says that would be dangerous. There was no further commitment from this Council as any remainder would come from public subscriptions. Cllr. Mr. Ransley asked what would happen if the public subscriptions ran out. The Inspector of the Lawful Development Certificate Hearing has said that the Parish Councils can participate fully and its lawyer can be there; this would be in May. The Inquiry was later and they had suggested September, but the Parish Council's barrister was getting married in September and if this date could not be changed there may be a need to use Stephen Tromans QC who was more senior and more expensive, but that would depend on the public being willing to pay for it.

Cllr. Mrs. Gillett thought that this Parish Council should pay £2,125.00. Cllr. Mr. Ransley asked if there were sufficient funds to cover the Certificate of Lawfulness hearing. The Chairman confirmed this and his understanding was that there was sufficient money for the Inquiry as well.

Cllr. Mrs. Gillett Proposed; Seconded Cllr. Mrs. Fenney and **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED** to pay a contribution to Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council in the sum of £2,125.00.

- (b) **Update/Freedom of Information.** The Chairman explained that in fact the request received was not a Freedom of Information request, but came under the Environmental Information Regulations, 2004. The two Parish Councils were working closely on this. The applicant had been asked to resubmit his request under the EIR. The majority of the information requested was already in the public domain, but the legal information requested did not need to be disclosed as this was legal privilege. The legal basis to commission planning and legal advice came under Section 222 of the Local Government Act 1972. There was also a need to ensure that there was no contravention of the Data Protection Act so all personal data had to be excluded.
- (c) **Statement of Case.** The statement of case was required shortly and there was a need to agree the report by the AD expert. The Chairman asked if the Council were happy to delegate the Clerk in association with the Chairman to agree these. This was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED.**
237. **APPROVAL OF UPDATED THREE-YEAR BUSINESS PLAN.** This was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED.**
238. **PARKING IN KIRDFORD ROAD** – update. Cllr. Mrs. Fenney advised that having drawn a blank with the PCSO she had contacted the Sergeant who had asked the PCSO to call on the resident which he did and raised the concerns, but when he looked at the vehicles there was no issue of concern as they were clearly visible from both directions, but advised they should not park closer to the corner and the resident agreed not to do this. If there was a problem people should call the Police on either 101 or 999 in an emergency. The Police had accepted that it was a safety issue. Cllr. Mrs. Fenney was thanked for her efforts regarding this matter.
239. **WEBSITE** – implementation of Parish Council email addresses/protocol for use required. The Chairman felt that the new Council e-mails should be set up as soon as possible and there was a need for a protocol on how use it. It was **AGREED** to aim for the 1st March, 2016.
240. **POLICY UPDATE** – agreement to update publication policy. Currently the charge for A4 photocopies was only 5p whereas the cost for photocopying was now 10p. It was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED** that this change should be made and the Clerk should check to see if any other changes were required to ensure it met the 2009 requirements.
241. **QUEEN'S 90th BIRTHDAY CELEBRATIONS** – update/beacons/PC involvement Cllr. Mrs. Gillett mentioned that the Clerk had let her have the e-mail received from the landlord of the Foresters Arms and she would be making contact with them. She handed the Clerk the notes of the last meeting and advised that everything was coming along well. The Clerk was applying for a grant of £250 from CDC who would release funds if invoices in the name of the Parish Council were received. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett explained that in reality there was a need for the funds up front because there was a need to pay

for things like Punch and Judy deposit, TENS license, etc., so she wondered whether the Parish Council would pay these costs and then recoup the funds when these were received from CDC. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett advised that the total spend would be no more than £750.00. The Clerk in association with Cllr. Mrs. Gillett was delegated authority to supervise expenditure up to the sum of £750.00 ensuring it met Financial Regulations (£500.00 from the Parish Council and the £250.00 to come from CDC).

The Chairman asked if there was to be a Beacon, as there was to be a national Beacon event in April. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett stated that they were thinking of doing it on 12th June. The Chairman asked if the necessary Health and Safety risk assessments would be provided. This was confirmed. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett undertook to investigate this to ensure it fitted in with national beacons.

242. **CALA APPLICATION** – update (meeting with officer/Viability Appraisal/HNS). The Chairman advised that a meeting was to take place between some members of the Planning Committee and the CDC Officer dealing with this application to clarify certain aspects and to give the Officer a chance to visit the site and ask questions.

243. **VILLAGE HALL AND RECREATION GROUND CHARITIES TRUSTEES** – agreement of governance. The Chairman had provided the following information :-

- Both the Village Hall and the Recreation Ground are held in formal trusts by the Parish Council and are therefore subject to the rules surrounding charitable trusts defined by the Charities Commission.
- There are three classes of trustee Sole, Custodian and Management Trustees. Sole Trustees are responsible for holding the assets of the trust and for the day to day management unless the Charity is changed so that the Parish Council would become Custodian Trustees and Management Trustees are set up for day to day management.
- Day to day management of a Trust involves compliance with charity rules (amongst other things) health & safety, financial accounting, maintenance and safe keeping of the assets owned by the trust, governance/management, preparation and submission of timely accounts to the Charities Commission.
- As historically (at least since I have been a member) the Parish Council has not been involved in any of the activities of Management Trustees it was assumed that the Recreation Ground & Village Hall committees were in fact Management Trustees. The Parish Council has recently been advised by the Charities Commission that this is not the case so the Parish Council is directly responsible for those matters.
- The recently prepared memorandum of understanding for the recreation ground assumed that the committee were the Management Trustees.
- There are, therefore, two main choices :-
 1. Operationally continue exactly as it is currently, but this would involve setting up Management Trustees
 2. The Parish Council formally delegates responsibility for day to day operational (management) responsibilities and compliance with Charity rules to the Recreation

Ground and Village Hall Committees (much as was thought the position was). However, for the Parish Council to discharge its responsibility as Trustees certain controls and monitoring would need to be put in place

- These controls and monitoring would involve the formal delegation of responsibility to Parish Council members/Trustees on the committees, receiving regular reports covering activities/compliance/financial accounts, etc., and timely annual accounts/returns for approval prior to submission to the Charities Commission.

The Parish Council was asked to decide which option to implement.

Cllr. Miss Pinder considered they ran fine, but the Chairman pointed out that there was no do nothing option, but there were a number of choices. The Parish Council was the Sole Trustee of the Recreation Ground and Village Hall and thereby responsible for what goes on. The options were to :-

1. Set up Management Trustees with the Charity Commission.
2. Parish Council to be totally responsible with bank accounts in the Council's name, i.e., Kirdford Parish Council Recreation Ground Committee.
3. The Parish to formally appoint representatives onto the two committees and to delegate those committees to run the two facilities on its behalf and to then present an Annual Report including accounts to the Council at the Annual Parish Meeting each year.

Following discussion IT WAS **RESOLVED** :-

To adopt option three and the Clerk should document the details of the arm's length arrangements and these should be presented next month.

244. **TO CONSIDER APPROVING GIVING THE CONTRACT FOR ADDITIONAL PLAY EQUIPMENT AT SCHOOL COURT TO PLAYDALE PLAYGROUNDS LTD., IN THE SUM OF £13,155.88.** Cllr. Mrs. Gillett presented the background paper :-

“A revised quotation from Playdale had been received with was slightly cheaper (by £34) than the quote the Parish Council accepted originally upon which the Council's application for a grant from Chichester District Council was based.

The good news is that CDC has awarded the Council the £5,000 applied for and with the £7,000 the Council has allocated from its own funds and about £985 of fundraising money and donations already received it was recommended to go ahead and place the order. My reckoning is that the Council is £170 short which can easily be raised by asking for donations and this final couple of hundred pounds will not be needed until the playground works are completed.

Cllr. Mrs. Nutting had been in contact with Playdale whose representative is coming to

look at School Court on 9th February. She will then draw up the plan which will be used when the installation is done. Unfortunately, the drawings will not be ready for the Parish Council Meeting on 15th February. She had also been informed that once the Council has placed the order and paid the deposit there would be a six to eight week wait for the work to start.

I would like to propose to the Parish Council that it authorize the Clerk to place the order and pay the deposit as soon as the Working Party has seen and agreed the actual drawings which will be ready on Monday, 22nd February. This is because otherwise there will be a three week wait for the Council to meet to approve the order which just adds more time to the long wait already had.

It is recommended that the Council vote on this proposal and agree with the plan to move things along as quickly as possible.”

Cllr. Miss Pinder suggested that there was a need for a large sign showing the location of this play area. In the past many parents would not let their children play there and no one knew where it was. It was suggested there should be some kind of campaign to make people aware. The Chairman asked what the evidence base was that this was what the village wanted and that it would be used. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett advised that it was known that is was what was wanted as this information came out of the results of the questionnaire and open morning where people selected certain types of equipment. Cllr. Miss Pinder felt there was a need to publicize it.

The Chairman pointed out that on the financial side the briefing paper says that the Council had approved the £13,155.88 but no such minute could be located. The Council had pledged to contribute up to £7,000.00 in order that Cllr. Mrs. Nutting could apply to CDC for a grant of £5,000.00. The Clerk was asked if the Council approved this would it comply with financial regulations. The Clerk advised that unfortunately it would not as there was no minute stating details of the three quotations obtained and the reasons for selecting that particular supplier. Cllr. Mrs. Goddard advised that four companies had been invited to quote, but one had declined.

The Chairman pointed out that currently no details about the terms and conditions of the contract were known, how much deposit was required, whether there was to be a retention. Therefore, the Clerk was asked to try and obtain this information and for there to then be another quick Council meeting on the 24th February at 6.00 p.m., in the Village Hall just to consider :-

- (a) the competitive quotations received and the recommendation of the Working Party to go with the Playdale quotation in the sum of £13,155.88 plus V.A.T., together with consideration of the contract terms.
- (b) funding for this – confirmation of Grant funding and agreement for Council to contribute the sum of £7,000.00.
- (c) authorize the Clerk to sign the contract and place the order.

245. **THINK VILLAGES** – update. The notes of the recent meeting had been distributed to members. They had the option on the Townfield land. It was agreed the timing was not right at the moment due to the Cala application.

246. **RECRUITMENT OF NEW CLERK AND DEPUTY CLERK** – progress/update and contingency plans for handover of tasks (e.g. webmaster). An applicant was going to be interviewed for the Deputy Clerk position on Thursday. One application had been received for the Clerk's position, but they lived in St. Leonards on Sea. The Chairman felt the Council should assume that it will not have a Clerk when the existing Clerk leaves, so wondered who would be in a position to do things like the accounts, website, etc. Cllr. Miss Pinder felt that the advertisement for the position needed 'jazzing up'. Cllr. Mr. Ransley stated that if necessary the Council could reduce the business of the Council to the minimum after April. The Chairman felt there was a need for a contingency plan. Cllr. Mr. Ransley suggested that SALC be asked if they could provide a Locum Clerk.
247. **COMMUNITY ASSETS** – to consider listing the Community Shop. Cllr. Mr. Ransley pointed out that the shop was owned by the community and if registered all that would happen if they wanted to sell it was to have to wait six months to allow the community the opportunity to buy it. The Chairman stated that the shop was owned by shareholders, part of the community, so the committee could propose to the shareholders to sell the shop. It could then be sold and be a loss to the community. It was wondered whether someone could advise how many shareholders there were. No resident could hold more than one share. It was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED** not to register the Village Shop.
248. **TO COMMENT ON THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION** – Electoral Review of Chichester – closing date 4th April, 2016. This document should be responded to.
249. **TO CONSIDER COMMENTING ON THE CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PLANNING OBLIGATIONS AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT** – approach for securing development contributions to mitigate additional traffic impacts on the A.27 Chichester Bypass. Comment date 11th March, 2016. It was **AGREED** not to comment.
250. **TO CONSIDER THE REQUEST FROM CHICHESTER OBSERVER REGARDING REGULAR COLUMN ON COUNCIL NEWS.** Cllr. Mr. Campbell stated that interest from the press could be helpful, but it was **AGEED** to refer her to the Parish Council website where all agendas and minutes were in the public domain and should she require any further information the Council would then be more than happy to talk to her.
251. **COUNCILLORS TO REPORT ANY POSSIBLE HEALTH AND SAFETY PROBLEMS.** Cllr. Mrs. Gillett reported that there was a water leak on Hayling Green and the water was now encroaching onto the highway which if it froze could cause a highway safety issue. This should therefore be reported to Southern Water and also to WSCC Highways.

The highway white lines were extremely faded and there were still some loose stone on the edge of the road in the village. These matters had previously been reported to WSCC Highways.

Cllr. Miss Pinder reported that WSCC might be able to supply some fill to repair the footpath from Growers to Herons. Cllr. Mrs. Gillett stated that a resident was willing to organize a working party.

252. **FOLLOW UP ON ACTION LIST.** The Clerk would e-mail members.
253. **TO CONSIDER BANK RECONCILIATION FOR JANUARY, 2016.** This was duly **APPROVED.**
254. **ACCOUNTS TO BE PAID.**

<u>Date</u>	<u>ChqNo</u>	<u>To Whom Paid</u>	<u>Supply</u>	<u>Net £</u>	<u>VAT £</u>	<u>Total £</u>
4.2.16	001575	Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council	Contribution to Crouchland Legal Costs	£ 5,000.00	£ 0.00	£ 5,000.00
15.2.16	001576	Society of Local Council Clerks	Subscription	£ 167.00	£ 0.00	£ 167.00
15.2.16	001577	Chichester District Council	Election Costs 2015	£ 200.50	£ 0.00	£ 200.50
15.2.16	001578	SSALC Limited	Training	£ 55.00	£ 11.00	£ 66.00
15.2.16	001579	Mrs. I. Marshall	February Salary	£ 1,241.54	£ 0.00	£ 1,241.54
15.2.16	001580	HM Revenue & Customs	Mth 11 Contributions	£ 431.28	£ 0.00	£ 431.28
15.2.16	001581	Mrs. I. Marshall	Office Expenses	£ 255.96	£ 0.00	£ 255.96
		<u>Total</u>		<u>£7,351.28</u>	<u>£ 11.00</u>	<u>£7,362.28</u>

These were duly **APPROVED.**

255. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** – to receive and note any further questions, comments or representations made by members of the public.
256. **DATE OF NEXT PARISH COUNCIL MEETING** – 21st March, 2016 and an additional meeting on Wednesday, 24th February, 2016.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.50 p.m.