

Key additional facts and viewpoints to consider in fully assessing the new Orchard Group proposal could reasonably include:-

1. The Amenities committee EOM meeting minutes for 5th Feb 2019 read:-
80.3 Steyning Community Orchard – Cllr Sullivan did not take part in discussion nor vote as had declared an interest. There was a need to discuss and agree the planting regime as per request on supporting papers. Cllr Lloyd **proposed**, **seconded** by Cllr Toomey that council accepts the plans put forward by the SCO for their planting plans (A to G inclusive) but that there should be no further ‘creep’ onto the remainder of the MPF. **Agreed**
What has changed since then that now warrants SPC overturning this important final orchard boundary statement?
2. The Orchard Group has already diversified their activities, creating new community orchards on land that is privately owned but allows public access. These orchards include land adjacent to the Steyning rifle range, and near the newly created Bramber Brooks nature site. So why are the group now requesting yet more land on the Memorial Playing Field?
What community need does this orchard expansion address?
3. There are apparently currently 47 fruit trees in this orchard, including 16 original trees, now pruned and in good health, and 31 new trees planted over 7 years. The new request is for land to accommodate the planting of 18 more trees, making a total of 63. What is the community benefit of this expansion; a 63 tree orchard instead of a 47 tree orchard?
4. The supplied plan was effectively an outline planting-plan showing existing trees and 18 new trees. There should also be a location plan which clearly indicates the area of the new land sought compared to the existing orchard and shows:-
 - a. The entire MPF, and how this proposal relates to the existing playing field and leisure space. This will also make clear how visible the new saplings and protective cages will be from other parts of the MPF, particularly the popular northern boundary.
 - b. Clear marking of the proposed new orchard boundary line (including the protective cages and likely future branch spread).
 - c. Clear indication of existing MPF playing equipment, especially those nearer the orchard site.
 - d. Indication of the intended access path to the nearby MPF exit.
5. How does the public use this area of land already? (My observations over the last week of fine weather, evidenced several family groups choosing to sit or picnic in the area concerned, while their children played nearby).
6. What are the potential negative impacts or possible unintended consequences on the MPF and its myriad users? Are there any Village Green legal issues to be considered? Responsibility for future maintenance issues & costs of the orchard for SPC? (The presenter assured the committee that the group would be responsible for any such

work, however its currently unclear how they would guarantee such a commitment in perpetuity?)

7. Who else should be consulted about reducing the sports/recreation/leisure area of the MPF? Potentially, this could include relevant sports clubs (football, cricket, tennis, bowls), children, young people and the local schools, Sport England maybe.