

MEETING OF FULL PARISH COUNCIL

HELD ON MONDAY 19th JULY 2021 AT 7.30PM

Councillors Present : Cllrs Norcross (Chairman), Lloyd, S. Sullivan, G. Sullivan, I. Alexander, Goldsmith, Bell, Young, Campbell and S. Alexander.

Clerks in attendance : John Fullbrook and Hazel Roxby

Members of the Public : 11

Meeting commenced 7.30 pm

MINUTES

ACTION

FULL/21/34 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

34.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Northam, Hanson, and Trundle. Cllr Rudkin was absent. Apologies also received from West Sussex County Councillor Linehan, and District Councillor Platt

FULL/21/35 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

35.1 None received

FULL/21/36 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR (in Summary)

36.1.1 **Q.** – A lady made a statement and asked - At the 22nd June meeting of the full council Councillor Norcross wanted to put the record straight, indicating that Cllr Campbell has misled everyone by wrongly reporting that the SPC plan had passed HDC analysis with flying colours and by wrongly reporting that Chris Paterson praised the plan and in particular the local green space designation. My question is- Is it true that Cllr Campbell misled everyone in this way?

36.1.2 **A.** – Cllr Campbell made a statement in which he refuted the statement Councillor Norcross made at the previous meeting noting that the plan had indeed passed an initial legal compliance check and that also he had been at a meeting in March 2020 with Chris Paterson, and at that meeting he had noted that Mr Paterson had said the plan was well written and that he appreciated the granularity within the LGS assessment. The full statement can be heard between minute 2.11 and 7.35 on the video on the SPC Web site via the link below

36.2.1 **Q.** - Mr Russell Barnes asked questions relating to item 9 on the agenda. Question 1 – There has been some speculation on social media by a resident with regards to the Confidentiality Agreement, but I wondered if the Chair could confirm who is actioning this request, SPC or HDC? Question 2 – If it is the latter, is the Chair able to advise on the reasoning behind the need for a Confidentiality Agreement, I assume there is a reasonable and valid need? Question 3a – Subject to the outcome of all items relating to the Neighbourhood Plan tonight, can the Chair advise if the Council are mindful to offer an ongoing and long-term commitment to Neighbourhood Planning post the short-term need that we assume the Committee will be tasked with? Note I think the community were previously advised there would be a review every 5 years rather than ongoing development. Question 3b – If there is a keenness to keep the Plan relevant and response to current needs, will it be directed to specifically address the; environmental, social, and economic objectives in modern society in response to the global pandemic and the acknowledged global Climate Emergency and will a responsive Plan seek to support established groups in Steyping and District to meet the 2030 target many of us are working toward presently?

- 36.2.2** *A. – The Chair replied that these matters will be discussed under item 9, however for clarity the confidentiality agreement was issued by HDC not SPC*
- 36.3.1** *Q. – Mr Trevor Cree made a statement - If anyone wants to know what the SDNP thought about the neighbourhood plan you can do a google search SDNP authority – Steyning neighbourhood plan and it's all there and its very positive what was written by the SDNP authority. His question - I see there is no discussion or agreement about the appointment of Andrew Metcalfe who obviously is a key person in the steering committee's response to examiners questions. Can we therefore have some clarification is he still employed and has the relative pay been agreed because its fundamentally important that he is involved?*
- 36.3.2** *A – The Clerk replied that the appointment terms and pay rate had been established at a previous Full Council meeting and that the agreement still applies.*
- 36.3.3** *Q. – Mr Cree asked do we need to re-appoint him and for how long is he going to be involved*
- 36.2.4** *A. – The Clerk replied it depended on the amount of work involved*
- 36.4.1** *Q. – Robert Mattinson made a statement saying - may I make a comment about what Trevor has just mentioned. I agree with him that the national park policy is there and its informative and worth reading and does address some of the issues that we are all involved in. He says it's very supportive but again it's like saying 'approving' or 'approving of' certain things, there is a distinction. The last paragraph of that document says The SDNP authority is supportive of the principle of local green space designation, we are mindful however of the criteria of the national planning framework that state LGS designation should only be used where a green space is special to the local community and holds a particular local significance and that designated land that is LGS should be consistent with the local planning saleable development. In light of this the independent examiner may come to a view one or more of the proposed sites do not meet the tests of the NPPF. The SDNP Authority will duly consider any recommendation the examiner decides to make, which puts a slightly different light on Trevor's idea that its fully supportive.*

FULL/21/37 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- 37.1** Cllr Campbell **proposed, seconded** by Cllr S. Sullivan an amendment to the 22nd June 2021 minutes so that item 26.1 to read 'Cllr Campbell' rather than 'an SPC Councillor'. **Agreed**
- 37.2** Cllr Norcross **proposed, seconded** by Cllr S. Alexander that the minutes for the 22nd June 2021 meeting be accepted, subject to amendment at 26.1, as a true and fair record. **Agreed**

FULL/21/38 MATTERS ARISING

- were taken as read as per agenda (Except item 38.2 as Cllr Linehan not in attendance).
- 38.1** Clerk to send details of Ham Farm Soft Sands to Cllr Linehan – **Actioned**
- 38.2** Cllr Linehan to pursue WSCC Highways to see if deregistered disabled parking bay lines can be removed – **Ongoing** Cllr Linehan
- 38.3** Report back on Ham Farm Soft Sands Working Party Meeting – **See item 39.3**
- 38.4** Cllr S Alexander to be representative for Towers Campus and Steyning Grammar School travel initiatives - **Actioned**
- 38.5** Steyning Neighbourhood plan to be reconstituted – **Actioned**
- 38.6** Clerk and Cllr Bell to contact previous steering committee persons to see if they are willing to put their name forward for the new steering group – **Actioned / See item 42.2**
- 38.7** Update Steering Committee Terms of Reference – **See item 42.3**
- 38.8** Send signed section 1 and 2 with associated notes to the external auditor and publish 'Notice of Public Rights' - **Actioned**

- 38.9 SPC publish amended Steyning PC Meeting Schedule 2021/22 - **Actioned**
- 38.10 Request HR services to send copies of all correspondence between them and Steyning Parish Councillors - **Actioned**
- 38.11 Question raised by resident regards Neighbourhood Plan to be dealt with at a later meeting – **See item 42.3**
- FULL/21/39 SPC COMMUNITY PROJECTS**
- 39.1.1 **Short presentation on ‘Broadband for Rural Communities’ proposed rollout from Virgin Mobile Regional Community Liaison Officer** – This presentation was primarily to familiarise Councillors and residents in attendance with the proposed scheme whereby Virgin Media are utilizing the governments gigabit voucher scheme to benefit the Steyning and surrounding communities and help make the parish ‘future safe’ in terms of high-speed internet connection. {Details of the content can be seen via SPC Web site video/audio link and supporting papers}
- 39.1.2 A Q&A session followed – items discussed included the fact that other providers could well take up the scheme although the Virgin Media roll out, being the only company actively pursuing the scheme locally, has been endorsed by WSCC. The area of rollout is restricted, with outlying residents not currently being serviced, although they could be added on. There were also concerns as to the nature of the commitment Steyning residents would have to make when ‘signing up’ to a twelve-month contract. The Chair suggested that any further questions be brought to the public meeting due to take place in the Steyning Centre on the 27th July 2021.
- 39.2 To discuss the Highways Scheme Application from the ‘20 mph Steyning Speed Limit’ project working party following SPC Community Committees recommendation to so. Cllr I. Alexander **proposed, seconded** by Cllr Lloyd that SPC support the Highways Scheme application to West Sussex subject to agreed changes to improved economic growth section and improving traveller experience. **Agreed** {Clerk to amend , liaise with Geoff Barnard and send application} **CLERK**
- 39.3 Clerk updated on progress concerning the proposed Ham Farm Soft Sands and stated the working party had completed a draft brief for planning consultants as per supporting papers. The working party had also made contact with residents {or group} who lived in close proximity and who might want to take the matter forward for themselves, as it was felt that SPC could not commit to the kinds of expenditure that this was liable to take. Cllr Lloyd **proposed, seconded** by Cllr Campbell to liaise with the group, offer moral support and any other support the that the Council is able to give. **Agreed** **CLERK**
- FULL/21/40 REPORT FROM COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS**
- 40.1 Neither Cllr Linehan (WSCC) nor Cllr Bob Platt (HDC) were in attendance. Cllr Tim Lloyd – (HDC) had already updated on the Broadband rollout under item 39.1. And updated that the HDC Draft Local Plan was due to come before their Council – Further news to follow.
- FULL/21/41 NEIGHBOURHOOD WARDENS’ REPORT**
- 41.1 Council received the Neighbourhood Wardens report for July 2021. Cllr Lloyd suggested the Wardens report in the future on the rise in antisocial behaviour and what is being done to avoid the issue. **CLERK**
- 41.2 The unlicensed music event / rave at the end of June 2021 was discussed. Information had been immediately placed on the SPC web site at the time, as had a link to police news releases (See supporting papers for details). The Chief Constable had been in contact with Cllr **Cllr Lloyd**

Lloyd who had expressed concern at the recent public consultation event at the High Street Car Park and reported that there is a meeting planned to include other District and County Council representatives and that he would report back to SPC on that meeting.

FULL/21/42 SPC NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 42.1** SPC had been asked to sign a confidentiality agreement between SPC and HDC in relation to responses to resident representations regarding the SPC Neighbourhood Plan consultation process. A great deal was discussed and especially in relation to the explanation given by HDC for the reasons associated with their proposal. {The main reason appended to these minutes}. It was felt greater explanation was required. Cllr Campbell **proposed, seconded** Cllr S. Sullivan that SPC defer the decision (signing the agreement) until such time as the Clerk has had adequate explanation from Horsham (HDC). **Agreed 9 For, 1 Abstained JN.** **CLERK**
- 42.2** Council discussed the appointment of the resident volunteers to the reconstituted Steyning Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee. Cllr Campbell **proposed, seconded** by Cllr Goldsmith that every candidate needs to be asked to certify that at no time have they had any meetings with, discussions with, email correspondence with, phone conversations with, any landowner or their representative without the Clerk being present and if they have to give full evidence of the particulars. **Not Agreed 4 For {RG, PC, SS, GS}, 5 Against {JN, IA, SA, RB, TL} 1 Abstained {CY}.** Cllr Norcross **proposed, seconded** by Cllr S. Alexander that the six named volunteers who had expressed a continued interest, these being Mariella Alexander, Russell Barnes, Paul Cotton, Paul Maidment, Nick Muggridge and Murray van der Poll are appointed the resident volunteers to the Steyning Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee. **Agreed 5 For {JN, CY, RB, SA, TL}, 4 Against {SS, GS, RG, PC}, 1 Abstained {IA, as declared personal interest}** **CLERK**
- 42.3** To discuss the Steyning Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee's Terms of Reference as per supporting papers supplied and amended by the current members of the NP Steering Committee. Further amendments were suggested – these as follows. Cllr Campbell **proposed** an amendment to Cllr Lloyds **proposal, seconded** by Cllr S. Sullivan that the main purpose is to respond to the questions raised by the examiner and look at where any amendments to the Neighbourhood plan submitted in 2019 are considered necessary in order to meet any objections raised by the examiner, such motion to substitute 1A {within the N. Plan terms of reference}. **Not Agreed 4 For {PC, RG, SSu, GSu}, 6 Against {SA, IA, TL, CY, JN, RB}:** The following original proposal was to replace 1a within the N. Plan - Cllr Lloyd **proposed, seconded** by Cllr I Alexander that the main purpose is to respond to the questions raised by the Examiner and look at where any amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan submitted in 2019 are considered necessary. **Agreed- 6 For {SA, IA, TL, CY, JN, RB} 4 Against {PC, RG, SSu, GSu}** Cllr Campbell **proposed, seconded** by Cllr S Sullivan that the provision within the {Terms of reference} agreement 6d, which currently reads 'The Steering Committee will agree Chair and Vice Chair, from its membership.' is struck out and in its place, it reads 'The Full Council will agree a Chair and a Vice Chair.' **Agreed.** Cllr Norcross **proposed, seconded** by Cllr I Alexander that SPC accepts the terms of reference subject to the two amendments that have been agreed this evening {earlier in this meeting}. **Agreed - 6 For {SA, IA, TL, CY, JN, RB} 4 Against {PC, RG, SSu, GSu}** **CLERK**
- 42.4** Cllr Campbell **proposed, seconded** by Cllr S Sullivan that when SPC receive a final version clarification note from the Examiner and a complete summary of representations that the SPC N. Plan Steering committee has authority to prepare a draft response, in consultation with Andrew Metcalf, for recommendation for Full Council's agreement. **Agreed** **CLERK**

FULL/21/43 GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE MATTERS

43.1 Cllr Norcross **proposed, seconded** Cllr Young to agree payment of the £1,512 Vintage Years grant. **Agreed.** The Clerk was also asked to suggest to Vintage Years an update of their web site to possibly include thanks to SPC as well as the Wilson Memorial Trust for sponsorship of the staffing position this grant relates to. **CLERK**

43.2 To discuss the recommendation from the budget working party that SPC purchase the Christmas light package for Steyning High Street as per supporting papers. The larger sum proposed for year 1 was in order to cover installation, thereafter the main cost is that of the light rental. Cllr Lloyd **proposed, seconded** by Cllr S Alexander that we agree the installation costs of up to £3,474 (18 x £193 per lamppost) for the Christmas lights plus VAT {that's to provide fittings for the ongoing years} and that SPC further agree up to a total maximum charge of £5822.90 per annum for the three year rental of the lights to be fixed to various fixings subject to the clerk finding alternative quotes and then the community committee making a final choice. **Agreed - 6 For {SA, IA, TL, CY, JN, RB} 4 Abstentions {PC, RG, SSu, GSu}** **CLERK**

Note *The Meeting ran out of time at this point with the remaining agenda items to be brought forward to future Full Council Meeting.* **CLERK**

FULL/21/44 DATE OF NEXT FULL COUNCIL MEETING: 20th September 2021 at 7.30pm

Meeting closed at 10.01 pm

Signed Date 20th September 2021
Chairman

A Video recording of this meeting is available on the SPC Website or via this link below
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cJjCAoRbyLU>

To: John Fullbrook
Subject: Steyning Neighbourhood Plan and the Proposed Confidentiality Agreement

APPENDIX

- Noted in Minutes item 42.1 –

To be attached

From: Sharon.Evans <Sent: 19 July 2021 15:58

Subject: RE: Steyning Neighbourhood Plan and the Proposed Secrecy/Confidentiality Agreement

Dear Paul, John and Hazel

The disclosure of the representations (with some redactions) to the Neighbourhood Plan is being made to Steyning Parish Council so that the Parish Council can respond to the examiner on the representations made. It is considered that this would be more helpful to the Parish Council than simply providing a summarised versions of the responses, Horsham District Council will only be publishing a summary of the responses, and the non-disclosure/ confidentiality agreement is necessary to facilitate this disclosure for the purposes of responding to the examiner and to ensure that the representations are not published or provided to any other parties.

I trusts this clarifies our position.

Best regards

Sharon Evans

Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Monitoring Officer.
Data Protection Officer and Solicitor

Telephone:

