



Established 1894

## Angmering Parish Council

The Corner House  
The Square  
Angmering  
West Sussex BN16 4EA

Telephone/Answerphone: 01903 772124  
E-mail: [admin@angmering-pc.gov.uk](mailto:admin@angmering-pc.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.angmeringparishcouncil.gov.uk](http://www.angmeringparishcouncil.gov.uk)

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ANGMERING PARISH COUNCIL HELD IN THE KING SUITE OF THE ANGMERING VILLAGE HALL ON MONDAY 14 MARCH 2016**

**Present:** Councillors Bill Evans; Susan Francis (Chairman); Norma Harris; Mike Hill-Smith; Steven Mountain; John Oldfield; Roger Phelon; Peter Thompson; Sylvia Verrinder.

**In Attendance:** Rob Martin, Parish Clerk; Paul Barley, Deputy Clerk; co-option candidate Mike Jones; one member of the public.

#### **Action**

- 15/212 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**  
Received from Councillor Paul Bicknell, Lee Hamilton-Street and Nikki Hamilton-Street (illness), District Councillors Andy Cooper and Dudley Wensley, and County Councillor Deborah Urquhart.  
  
Apologies for absence had also been received from PCSO Rebecca Bernier, who was not on shift.
- 15/213 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**  
The Clerk and Deputy Clerk declared an interest in agenda item 20 as this item related to their respective contracts of employment.
- 15/214 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 8 FEBRUARY 2016**  
The minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
- 15/215 REPORT FROM SUSSEX POLICE**  
PCSO Bernier's report, circulated prior to the meeting, was taken as read.
- 15/216 COPTION OF NEW PARISH COUNCILLOR**  
The Chairman noted with regret that Mrs Lorraine Tarrant had been compelled to withdraw her co-option application by reason of ill-health.  
  
The Chairman welcomed Mr Mike Jones to the meeting and invited him to say a few words in support of his co-option application.  
  
Mr Jones explained that he was a retired police officer who wished to become involved in community matters. He had previously been involved in the Street Watch scheme before that had ceased operations.  
  
In response to questions from Councillors, Mr Jones confirmed that he had lived in the village for some five years. Now that he was retired, his availability for meetings was generally good. With regard to the Community Wardens scheme being promoted by the office of the PCC and

SSALC, Mr Jones noted that in his view, this was the start of a slippery slope towards a further reduction in police numbers, particularly in view of persistent anti-social behaviour, including litter, dog fouling, and substance abuse, in certain of the open spaces around the village. Police inaction on this was a matter of concern.

The matter then proceeded to a vote. The Chairman reminded Councillors that there was no obligation to appoint a co-option candidate merely because an application had been received.

On a proposal by Councillor Verrinder, seconded by Councillor Phelon: To co-opt Mike Jones as a Parish Councillor – unanimously **AGREED**.

Councillor Jones signed the Councillor Code of Conduct and took his seat among the councillors.

**15/217**

**THE CLERK'S REPORT ON MATTERS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS, BUT NOT INCLUDED ON THIS AGENDA**

The Clerk's report, circulated prior to the meeting, was taken as read.

The Clerk reported on the following additional matters:

**Clerks' Networking Day** – this had taken place on 8 March and there had been interesting and informative sessions on capacity building – in other words, how Parish and Town Councils might best fill the gaps left by withdrawals of service by County and District Councils.

The Burgess Hill model for highway maintenance (in that instance, the Town Council had assumed responsibility for minor highway repairs) was discussed in some depth. That might not be the right model for this Parish but there were other possible mechanisms.

The Chairman of Bolney Parish Council had given a presentation about how volunteers in that Parish for a variety of community tasks.

There was no question that further, substantial cuts were coming from WSCC, given its stated need to save £100 million over the next 5 years. What the towns and parishes need is the WSCC to be honest about what they will be unable to do in future.

**Palmer Road pavilion: urgent works** – the Clerk noted that the car park was dangerously potholed and the site was no longer secure, as the fence was broken and the gate could not be shut. This would need to be dealt with urgently as there were safety implications.

The Clerk also noted that the Chief Executive of SSALC, Trevor Leggo, had been impressed with the Parish Council's adoption of iPads for Councillors, and had made recommendations to other Parishes to adopt this form of technology for Council business.

**15/218**

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

The Chairman referred to her report, circulated prior to the meeting, and reproduced below:

"There is only one official engagement this month and that is after the writing of this report. On 12 March I am due to attend the Angmering Chorale's concert in Arundel Cathedral and I am really looking forward to it, I am sure it will be as excellent as always. I would like to thank them for their continued very kind invitations.

"This month has been full of working on the Community Land Trust,

Resilience plan and the problem with Arun wanting more houses in the parish.

**"Community Land Trust**

The Community Land Trust is progressing well and we are now at the scary stage of negotiating loans and bidding for properties. We are planning to go do public consultations starting this Saturday (19<sup>th</sup>) at the Community Centre Easter Market but I am sure there will be a full report from our Clerk on this.

**"Resilience Plan (previously Emergency Plan)**

The resilience plan is progressing well and we need more volunteers, again we are planning to go to the parish explaining what we are doing and what we need from them and how to prepare for an emergency.

**"Meet Your Councillor**

I did the "Meet Your Councillor" session on 5<sup>th</sup> March and I am pleased to day that three people attended. All three were talking about the speeding traffic through the village and the litter problem that is starting to plague the village. I would ask that everyone considers other people and drive carefully through our beautiful village and please put your litter in the bins provided. If anyone is interested in litter picking and an awareness campaign please do let me know.

**"The Library**

The good news of the month is that West Sussex County Council have agreed that the voluntary library can open on a Wednesday evening. It has been a long wait but a worthwhile one. The first session is planned for Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> May from 5 pm to 9pm and we will run with these times to test the water and review it after a few weeks. This does mean that we now need more volunteers for both sessions, split shifts are available if anyone is interested."

With regard to the matter of dog fouling and litter, Councillor Mountain noted that he would raise the matter of litter discarded by Angmering School pupils at the School's next governors' meeting. Councillor Mountain noted that the School was currently experiencing some problems with inclusion and behaviour of male pupils in years 8-10.

Clerk: tidy in the mornings as Roy clears up. PCSO Oakley is reluctant to get involved with things done by pupils outside school grounds. May be moving on after the reorganisation.

MJ: used to have a teacher on duty outside, which helped somewhat.

Maintenance Committee to have a think about this.

**15/219**

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

The member of the public present had no questions.

*The meeting reconvened.*

**15/220**

**REPORT FROM THE WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCILLOR**

County Councillor Urquhart had presented her apologies for the meeting.

**15/221**

**REPORTS FROM THE ARUN DISTRICT COUNCILLORS**

District Councillors Cooper and Wensley had presented their apologies for the meeting.

**15/222**

**PURCHASE OF ADDITIONAL MOWING EQUIPMENT**

The Chairman referred to the report to, and recommendation from, the

Parish Maintenance Committee (minute number 15/083, circulated prior to the present meeting) with regard to the acquisition of a new, additional mower.

It was noted that clarification was required in respect of the following matters:

1. How best to future-proof whatever machine is purchased;
2. Support and warranty coverage;
3. Storage;
4. Whether it would be more advantageous to acquire the machine by means of an operating lease or a lease-purchase agreement

The Clerk reported as follows:

1. *Future-proofing* – the recommended machine should have a service life of 5 years. It was to be noted that the 3-year writing-down period in the report was for accounting purposes rather than as a reflection of the machine's service life.
2. *Support and warranty coverage* – the machine was sold with a one-year manufacturer warranty, and support after that would be provided by Seymour & Lisle Ltd as required.
3. *Storage* – this was to be provided by Seymour & Lisle Ltd on their premises.
4. *Operating lease or lease purchase options* – the terms available at present were not particularly advantageous and represented a higher overall cost than an outright purchase.

It was noted that two resolutions were required to be considered in respect of this matter – whether to proceed with the acquisition of the new mower, and whether the acquisition should be funded from earmarked reserves.

Matters proceeded to a vote, as follows:

On a proposal by Councillor Phelon, seconded by Councillor Evans: That the new mower be purchased in accordance with the recommendation of the Parish Maintenance Committee – unanimously **AGREED**.

On a proposal by Councillor Phelon, seconded by Councillor Harris: That the purchase be funded by drawing down monies from earmarked reserves – unanimously **AGREED**.

**15/223**

#### **TREE REPLACEMENT**

The Chairman referred to the report to, and recommendation from, the Parish Maintenance Committee (minute number 15/087, circulated prior to the meeting) that up to £1,800 be expended, if necessary, to put in 12 trees that will be guaranteed for 12 months and maintained for 3 years, to replace those removed as part of the works to install the new cycle way on the north side of the A259 between South Drive and Station Road.

The Chairman noted that this was a big step forward from WSCC's previous unwillingness to consider any replanting in this location.

It was confirmed that the plan was for 12 trees, spaced away from the road signs, with a second tranche of planting over 3 years for a waist-height hedge. Planting would take place in January 2017.

Councillor Thompson asked whether it had been definitively established that WSCC would not be prepared to fund the planting scheme.

The Chairman noted that the position was at present uncertain as WSCC would not know what (if any) budget they would have for this until April

2016. £150/tree included planting and 3 years' maintenance. That was the cost ceiling so far as the Parish Council was concerned.

Councillor Thompson asked whether the Parish Council needed to commit to this now. Councillor Oldfield noted that it was necessary to have approval in principle up to a maximum outlay.

Councillor Verrinder asked whether the Woodland Trust had been approached. The Chairman noted that the Woodland Trust would only support certain types of planting.

Councillor Mountain noted that the report appeared to indicate that the figure of £150 per tree was purely for planting costs and did not include the tree. The Chairman noted that the figure was for supply and installation. WSCC had to give prior approval for the type of tree.

Councillor Mountain asked where exactly the trees would be planted. The Chairman noted that this would be between the cycle way and road, with the hedge filling the gaps between the trees.

Councillor Thompson noted that the concern would be if the hedge exceeded 3 feet in height. The Chairman noted that this had been considered and was considered to be OK. The height of the hedge from the cycle way would actually be about knee height due to the gradient of the land, which sloped down from the cycle way to the highway.

Councillor Mountain noted that there was a need to keep a close eye on the alignment of the proposed widening scheme, to make sure that any new planting would not be lost if and when the scheme went ahead. The Chairman noted that this was the reason for the involvement of the WSCC area supervisor – it also set a useful precedent for tree reinstatement proposals elsewhere.

The matter proceeded to a vote, as follows:

On a proposal by the Chairman, seconded by Councillor Phelon: That a maximum sum of £1,800 be earmarked for tree replacement should this be required – unanimously **AGREED**.

The matter of the proposed hedge planting was to be considered further by the Parish Maintenance Committee in due course.

**15/224**

#### **COMMUNITY WARDEN PILOT PROJECT**

The Chairman noted that this had been considered in the context of the resilience plan.

Councillor Thompson noted that the conclusion increasingly appeared to be that the Parish Council did not want to do this. Councillor Thompson asked whether, in that case, there was any scope for the Parish Council to fund a further PCSO or warranted Constable, who could then be shared with another parish.

The Chairman confirmed that the Parish was able to do that, but the reason why the possibility had not been pursued was that the Parish Council would have no influence or control over that person's deployment. This had been confirmed on a number of occasions by Sussex Police. The clear inference to be drawn was that, with the response-led policing model currently being used by Sussex Police under the Target Operating Model, a PCSO or PC funded by the Parish Council could be sent elsewhere, possibly for prolonged periods.

Councillor Thompson wondered whether the possibility could be explored further in any event. The Chairman noted that this would involve expenditure of a lot of money for something from which the Parish might derive little benefit.

Councillor Jones noted that Sussex Police could have solved this some years earlier if the Streetwatch concept (in which he had been involved) had been pushed a bit further – but the police had not been interested in supporting it. Streetwatch had been a good idea because it meant that volunteers were out in the community, visible, and getting a lot of support from the community.

The Chairman noted that she and the Clerk had had a meeting with the head of ADC's Anti-Social Behaviour Team in order to try and understand better the role of community wardens. That had resulted in a lengthy explanation of the business wardens in Littlehampton, who had been instrumental in reducing town centre crime by about a fifth. However, the role of business wardens was not on all fours with the proposed role of a community warden, and so the comparison was of limited value.

The Clerk noted that a large part of the business wardens' activities had involved escorting offenders to the police station, but that would not be an option now that Littlehampton police station was scheduled for closure, with the policing teams' base being moved to Bognor Regis, and it would remain to be seen whether the business wardens would retain their previous level of efficacy.

The Clerk stressed that there was a need to understand that the Parish was not going to get a lot of support from the police – Angmering was, despite perceptions to the contrary, a low-crime area and hence not a priority. Alternatives needed to be considered, most notably the community volunteers who were apparently being used to good effect elsewhere in the county. They could be engaged to do this and a variety of other things. The Chairman of Bolney Parish Council had expressed willingness to come down and explain his volunteer-driven model to interested parishes elsewhere.

Councillor Jones noted that he was involved in the Sussex Community Search team, which assisted in locating missing persons, and which numbered 124 people across the county. This showed that there were willing people about.

The Chairman noted that it was apparent that Community Wardens were not going to give this village what it needed. Her recommendation to Councillors was that the pilot scheme proposed was not proceeded with. It would be better to take some time to consider properly what was needed, rather than being pushed hastily into the pilot scheme just because there happened to be some time-limited grant funding.

Councillor Mountain noted that it would be much worse to start a pilot scheme and then stop it, than not to do it at all.

Councillor Phelon noted that the scope for involvement of Angmering in Bloom volunteers in other things of this kind was limited.

The Clerk noted that perhaps the key point was that the money this would cost, the grant funding available being only for part of the overall cost, could be better employed by the Parish in doing things directly.

The matter proceeded to a vote, as follows:

On a proposal by the Chairman, seconded by Councillor Mountain: That the Community Warden pilot project as outlined by Trevor Leggo not be proceeded with – unanimously **AGREED**.

The Clerk noted that he would advise Trevor Leggo of the Parish Council's decision forthwith.

The Chairman noted that the Parish Council needed to give serious thought to what we do want to do about the matters discussed under this agenda item, and within the context of resilience planning generally. An informal discussion would need to be held before anything firm could be put before the Parish Council for adoption.

**15/225**

#### **COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

The Chairman noted that, following discussion of this matter at previous Parish Council meetings, the Clerk had elaborated a rather simpler committee structure than that currently in place. This new proposed structure had been considered by the Governance and Oversight Committee and was now before the Council for adoption, if thought fit.

The Chairman noted that the Council's job was to set policy, but that this had gone down to minutiae in the various committees, which was not the right place. It had also become increasingly apparent that the division of labour between the current committees was not working as it could.

The proposed new structure involved having 3 main standing committees:  
Housing, Transport and Planning;  
Community, Leisure, Environment & Wellbeing;  
Governance, Oversight, Staffing and Resources.

Below this could exist a variety of sub-committees and the Clerk's suggestions as to what these might be were exactly that, and were accordingly open to discussion. It needed to be clearly stated at the outset what these might expect to achieve.

There was general discussion, in which it was noted that:

- the current structure had been intended to be the start of a process rather than a finished article, and had been developed in order to meet the needs of the Parish Council at the time;
- the proposed Housing, Transport and Planning Committee would retain the need to meet every three weeks to consider planning applications, but that every third meeting would have an expanded agenda in order to consider other matters within its remit;
- the current Emergency Committee's work would fall within the remit of the proposed Community, Leisure, Environment & Wellbeing Committee, and the Emergency Committee as currently constituted might well continue as a sub-committee of the proposed new committee;
- the current Parish Maintenance Committee had experienced a series of frustrating delays to its work, most notably with regard to the installation of defibrillators; this was, however, attributable to a significant extent to the prolonged period of ill-health suffered by the Administrator, who was responsible for taking forward much of that Committee's work.

Following discussion, the matter proceeded to a vote, as follows:

On a proposal by Councillor Thompson, seconded by Councillor Oldfield: That the new committee structure be adopted as per the proposals contained in the Clerk's report – Unanimously **AGREED**.

15/226

### COMMUNITY GRANT APPLICATIONS

The Chairman noted that two Community Grant applications had been received since the previous meeting. These were:

- a) Angmering Carpet Bowls Club - £400 for new bowls to replace damaged items;
- b) Angmering Twinning Association - £225.20 for a new planter to commemorate the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Angmering's twinning with Ouistreham-Riva-Bella

Office

These applications were considered in turn.

#### *Angmering Carpet Bowls Club:*

It was noted that it was not clear whether the Club had sought a contribution to the cost of replacement bowls from those who had damaged them, nor was it clear whether an insurance claim had been put in for them, and that these possibilities ought at least to be explored. It was also not clear what the actual cost was for a new set of bowls.

Councillor Harris noted that the Club appeared to want help with their general funds as well as to replace kit. A proper set of bowls would cost up to £200.

It was noted that the published criteria for community grants stated that they could not be awarded in order to provide funding for non-specific running costs. Accordingly, any award of grant could only be for a set of bowls, for which the sum of £200 was appropriate in view of Councillor Harris' comments.

On a proposal by Councillor Thompson, seconded by Councillor Harris: That a grant be awarded to Angmering Carpet Bowls Club in the sum £200 – unanimously **AGREED**.

#### *Angmering Twinning Association:*

It was noted that it was not clear from the application who would be responsible for maintaining the planter once it was installed, and that this would need to be clarified.

On a proposal by Councillor Thompson, seconded by Councillor Oldfield: That a grant be awarded in the sum of £225.20, provided that the project goes ahead as envisaged – unanimously **AGREED**.

The 2015/2016 budget for Community Grants was £3,000 and grants totalling £1,998 had been allocated to date, leaving an unspent fund of £1,002 for the year. It was clarified that there was no automatic rolling over of unspent grant funds into the next financial year.

15/227

### QUESTIONS ON THE ALREADY CIRCULATED NOTES OF MEETINGS OF PARISH COUNCIL WORKING PARTIES AND REPRESENTATIVES ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

- a) The ASRA Joint; Library; Major Development; and St Nicholas' Working Parties; and
- b) JDAC; JEAAC; ADALC; ASRA; JEAAC H&T and Angmering Village Hall Committees

Councillor Verrinder noted that she had attended a JDAC pre-meeting seminar on flooding and drainage – attendees had included representatives from Southern Water, the Environment Agency, Kevin MacNay of WSCC, and Karl Roberts, head of planning at ADC. This had been a somewhat tense meeting – it had become apparent that most surface water drainage in the area flowed to the Lidsey treatment plant. It

SNF

was not clear where Angmering's drainage ended up and Southern Water did not have many answers on that. Karl Roberts had come in for some criticism about the speed of development in Arun's part of the Committee's area.

15/228

**QUESTIONS RESULTING FROM COMMITTEES HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING**

An opportunity to ask questions resulting from the already circulated minutes of the meetings of the following committees:-

- a) The Planning & Conservation Committee meetings held on 1<sup>st</sup> & 23rd February 2016;
- b) The Parish Maintenance Committee meeting held on 24th February 2016.
- c) The Governance Committee held on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2016.

There were no questions.

15/229

**2015/2016 FINANCIAL REPORTS**

The reports were taken as read.

The Chairman noted that in order to cover all items on the agenda, it was necessary for Councillors to agree to continue the meeting for a short time after 21:30. This was unanimously **AGREED**.

15/230

**CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS**

On a proposal by Councillor Phelon, seconded by Councillor Evans: That, in accordance with Standing Order 1(c), the public and press should be excluded from the meeting for the next agenda item because their presence is prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted – unanimously **AGREED**.

The interests in the next agenda item declared by the Clerk and Deputy Clerk respectively were noted. It was agreed that the Clerk and Deputy Clerk would not be required to leave the room while the agenda item was being discussed.

15/232

**TO CONSIDER ANY URGENT MATTERS, FOR INFORMATION ONLY, ARISING SINCE THE PREPARATION OF THIS AGENDA**

None.

15/233

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled Meeting of the Parish Council would be held on Monday 11 April 2016 at 7.30 pm in the Village Hall.

**The meeting finished at 22:00.**

  
.....  
Chairman

Date..... 11<sup>th</sup> April 2016.....