

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF MAYFIELD AND
FIVE ASHES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD AT
LONDON HOUSE, HIGH STREET, MAYFIELD ON
WEDNESDAY 04 JANUARY 2006 AT 19.30 HOURS**

SUMMARY OF MEETING

- Health issues reviewed with agreement to discuss further with Dr Coates
- Plan timetable agreed and initial actions taken to produce a draft plan

ATTENDANCE

Philip Dixon (Chairman)	(PX)	Present and Voting
Peter Deller	(PD)	Present and Voting
Diane Kirkness	(DK)	Present and Voting
Martin Pitcher	(MP)	Apologies for Absence
Paul Amans	(PA)	Apologies for Absence
Diane Lea	(DL)	Mayfield Environment Group - Present
Iris Bruce*	(IB)	Mayfield Memorial Hall- Present
John Coulter	(JC)	Mayfield and Five Ashes Society - Present
Chris Maughan	(CM)	Mayfield Chamber of Commerce - Present
Leonard Trevellion	(LT)	Tuesday Afternoon Club - Apologies

Council Present and Voting 3
Not present 0

Apologies for absence 2
Other Council Business 0
Total 5

Organisation representatives present 4

Apologies for absence 1
Total 5

Also Present

David Thompson Parish Clerk (DT)

And one member of the public: J Redford.

*Until 20.00 hrs

MINUTES

1. COUNCILLORS DECLARATION OF INTEREST

1.1. There were no Councillors declarations of interest.

2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

2.1. There were no Chairman's announcements.

3. MINUTES OF MEETING 05 DECEMBER 2005

3.1. Noted that the minutes had been accepted by the Full Council at its meeting on 12 December 2005.

3.2. IB advised that J. Williams should read J. Winter. NOTE as the minutes had been approved by Council this change will be recorded in these minutes only.

4. MATTERS ARISING

4.1. DT reported that the Convent authorities had declined to make any land available for Car Parking

4.2. ACTIONS PROGRESS

• 5D6/5.13	PD to write paper on the actions needed with regard to Health Surgery issues - Done	CLOSED
• 5D6/7.1	DT to produce draft timetable to produce plan for next annual assembly. - Done	CLOSED

4.3. DT reported that the Planning application for the Oakdene site had been considered by the Wealden District Council and had been refused.

4.4. DT reported that the grant application for the Parish Plan had been lodged with WDC, but had been resubmitted to WDC in accordance with their new regulations. This had involved completing extra questions, but had been completed and subsequently acknowledged. If the grant was received it would mean that spending would need to be completed quickly, however this was in line with Parish Council needs.

4.5. There was some debate over the WDC funding process, and the problems caused by the recent changes to the process. It was felt that these problems would ease as the year progressed, but the problems caused to those seeking funding were significant. IB reported that the time limiting of grants also affected the application being made by the Memorial Hall.

5. HEALTH ISSUES

5.1. The debate carried out at the last meeting was summarised in the minutes, there was further debate over the issues, and the conclusions of the committee were:

- Not a short term issue.
- Not an emergency issue since the doctor can carry on for the time being at the present location.
- It was not sensible to try and force relocation in premises which though on offer did not meet the aspirations of the Doctor or the wishes of the Mayfield and Five Ashes population
- In debates held so far, the villages population had sent a clear message that a health centre, fit for purpose in the 21st century was required
- The problem was how to proceed:
 - action must lie with GP
 - PCT policy must be followed
 - Suitable sites were at a premium
 - The GP needed a project where there would be adequate reward

5.2. The first course of action considered was to send a questionnaire to Dr Coates and the Dentist in order to ascertain needs and establish how the council could assist. IB was against any further questionnaires being circulated in the village and this view was supported by CM and others.

5.3. After debate it was decided that the Clerk would attempt to arrange a meeting with Dr Coates at a mutually convenient time so that the issues could be discussed. The PC team would be restricted to DK, IB, and PX. The VOTE for this course of action was Unanimous.

ACTION DT

6. PARISH PLAN TIMETABLE

6.1 DT in response to action 5D6/7.1 had circulated a draft timetable which if adhered to would produce a draft plan in time for the Annual Assembly to consider.

6.2 IB wished to record her disagreement to the items in the plan which allowed for a questionnaire to be sent out. DT explained that if the committee wished to conduct a questionnaire, or any other sort of public consultation, this was the timescale for the activity to take place, but it did not mean that it had to take place. Equally any form of consultation outside of these time constraints were too early or too late.

6.3 After studying the timetable, the key issue was to produce consolidated action plans from the “Brainstorm” and the “Organisation” consultation. The agreed process was:

- DT to produce outline sketch plans, and circulate to groups as below
 - Transport PD
 - Environment DL JC
 - Social and Community DK PX
 - Economy CM

The other members to choose groups on which they would wish to participate.

The target date would be to produce general points by the next meeting on 6 February.

ACTION DT Outline Plans, Others complete group activities

6.4 DL requested an electronic copy of the original Brainstorm and Organisation consultation plan headings

ACTION DT

6.5 In the debate a need was identified by PD to produce some text detail on the issues expected over the next twenty years on which the plan was designed to meet. This was agreed. PX was of the view that it might be preferable to produce two plans:

- High Level
- Detailed action plans

6.6 PD asked who would write the plan, and the extent to which professional help should be sought. DT reported that AIRS would be visiting the village on 25 January at 0930 hours to give such advice, and that as a consequence of this meeting he would brief their representative on what was required.

ACTION DT

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1. PX drew attention to some further opportunities for Parish plan funding which included South East Rural Towns funding scheme.

7.2. JC raised the issue of District, County and Regional Plans which were also being formulated. It was agreed that the Parish Plan should be independent, but other plans were important and should be noted.

THE MEETING CLOSED AT 21.00 HOURS.

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE MAYFIELD AND FIVE ASHES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WILL BE:

DATE: Monday 6th February 2006

VENUE: London House

TIME: 19.30 hours.