

MAYFIELD AND FIVE ASHES PARISH COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MAYFIELD
AND FIVE ASHES PARISH COUNCIL
STATUTORY MEETING**

**HELD AT FIVE ASHES VILLAGE HALL
ON MONDAY 13 OCTOBER 2008 AT 1930 HOURS**

8C06

FINAL

MARTIN PITCHER
CHAIRMAN

**Chairman of Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council
Councillor Martin Pitcher**

SUMMARY OF MEETING

- Visit of Chair of Wealden District Council
- Village Green status resolution defeated
- Affordable housing policy debated
- MVC issues discussed, and current position notified.
- Transition Mayfield presentation made by group with request for PC representative.
- Footpath 13 issues noted.

ATTENDANCE

Martin Pitcher	(MP)	Present and Voting
Paul Amans	(PA)	Present and Voting
Peter Deller	(PD)	Present and Voting
Jane Driscoll	(JD)	Present and Voting
Elaine Wheeler	(EW)	Apologies for Absence (B)
Patricia Balfour	(PB)	Present and Voting
Jayne Bramwell	(JB)	Present and Voting
Graham Playfoot	(GP)	Present and Voting
Hubert Hills	(HH)	Present and Voting
Deveda Redman	(DR)	Present and Voting
Robert Fitzsimmons	(RF)	Present and Voting
Chris Lilly	(CL)	Present and Voting
Jerry Watkiss	(JW)	Present and Voting
Lloyd McLean	(LM)	Present and Voting (from 19.10 hrs)

Present and voting 13 Present and not voting 0
Apologies for Absence 1 Not present 0 Other Council Business 0

Also Present

Wealden District Councillors Jonica Fox (JF) and Robert Standley (RS), Brian Redman (BR) and ESCC Councillors Robert Tidy (RT) and Chris Dowling (CD) Councillor Chantal Wilson, Chairman WDC attended the meeting. David Thompson Parish Clerk (DT)

Apologies for Absence

G Wells (GW)

There were six members of the public present.

MINUTES

1. VISIT OF THE CHAIR OF WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL COUNCILLOR CHANTAL WILSON

- 1.1. Councillor Wilson thanked the Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council for the invitation to join the meeting and also thanked the Council for the background information which had been supplied.
- 1.2. The purpose of her visit to the Parish Council was to gain an appreciation of the activities, problems and the conduct of the Parish Council. Wealden had many parish councils; all were different and fiercely independent. She noted that the WDC and East Sussex councillors attended the Parish meetings and made reports.

- 1.3. Councillor Wilson then asked to be informed of the makeup of the Parish Council. This was:

Mayfield Ward	11 Members
Five Ashes Ward	3 Members
Rushers Cross Ward	1 Member

The recent election had been by a contested election in all but Rushers Cross Ward.

- 1.4. The Chairman then opened the meeting to questions.
- 1.5. JB asked if the disused tourist notice board in South Street car park could be made over to the Mayfield Village Centre (MVC) for their use. CW saw no reason why this could not be done and asked the portfolio holder Robert Standley to progress the issue.
- 1.6. In a second question JB asked whether Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council could be represented at the Planning Committee North on Thursday 16 October when the FP13 diversion was being discussed. It was noted that public requests to speak had to be registered on Tuesday morning. JB asked for the matter to be deferred because of the short notice given and the fact that the officer concerned G Kean could not be contacted. JF noted the problems and said she would examine what could be done and report back.

ACTION JF

CW noted that problems happened periodically, and that very few footpath problems are ever dealt with by the Planning Committee. LM considered that the importance of the footpath diversion had not been flagged up at an early stage, and the case should be moved to the next agenda.

- 1.7. PD asked that in view of the position held by CW as Chair of WDC whether she considered the workforce was efficient and competent. He considered that some WDC staff were good, but in many cases the Council lacked quality.

CW noted that there were 550 employees within WDC and like all large organisations, there would be problems. A directive had been issued on the importance of answering telephone calls. She would need full details to deal with specific complaints. Overall CW considered that most of WDCs work was dependent on manpower, and that WDC had good staff. It was noted that not everything could be a top priority.

- 1.8. CL outlined the current situation on the interlinked problems of:
 - South Street car park
 - South Street allotment site
 - South Street affordable housing project

He noted that there was a shortage of allotment sites in Mayfield and reported on the unsuccessful attempt by the Parish Council to get a temporary re-instatement of the South Street allotment site. The Clerk reported on the steps taken to try to get the allotments reinstated, and JF noted that the replies received were unsatisfactory. CW would follow up.

ACTION CW

- 1.9. DR asked what was the current position with regard to the boundaries review with WDC. The Parish Council Development Committee was reviewing boundaries as part of the Parish Plan and needed a review.

CW replied that the boundary review was one of many Central Government performance indicators, but the team concerned had major headaches on other issues, but it was believed that Mayfield was probably at the top of the review list, however currently there was a lack of money to progress the project. CW would examine the issue.

ACTION CW

- 1.10. LM raised the issue of the Argos Hill Windmill and said that WDC had reneged on their responsibilities, and that they should put the windmill back into good order before handing it over to a trust. The structure was listed and should have been cared for by WDC, who should have raised the necessary funds to achieve their aims. RS replied that a great deal of work had been done to set up a trust, and in his view everybody had to look forward. A trust could do many things which the Council could not and a substantial amount of money had been secured for the trust.

CW noted that WDC had been caught in the historic situation, they owned the windmill without adequate surrounding land to support its potential development, and that other WDC spending priorities affected decision making.

- 1.11. The Chairman thanked Councillor Wilson for her attendance and contribution to the work of the Mayfield and Five Ashes Full Council. Councillor Wilson asked to remain as an observer through all or part of the formal meeting.

FORMAL MEETING

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS BY COUNCILLORS AFFECTING AGENDA ITEMS

- 2.1. GP declared a personal interest as Chairman of the Five Ashes Village Hall Committee.
2.2. There were no other declarations of interest.

3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

- 3.1. Brian Horwood (MVC) circulated a background paper and posed three questions to the Full Council.
- Are all of the Councillors aware of the content of a letter 6 August 2008 from the Parish Clerk to Mr L T Wicker which enclosed a document entitled "Definition of land that could be made available to Mayfield Village Centre."
 - Are all of the Councillors aware that the area defined in the document makes the village centre impossible without first demolishing the existing building.
 - Is this restriction yet another hurdle in place to frustrate the efforts by the project committee to deliver a much needed facility.

PD said he was not aware of the letter – he considered the old National Playing Field Association’s decision that the land was not useful for outside recreation to be consent to develop.

The Clerk replied that the definition had been through at least two examinations by the F&GP Committee, and that fundamentally it followed the boundary of the conservation area, and movement over that boundary would need to be debated. He was not aware of the MVC proposals because the Parish Council did not have detailed drawings or costed proposals or a business plan for the project. The proposals in the original presentation had long been overtaken, and the plan enclosed with the circulated paper was incorrect.

PA noted that the Committee would need to see plans and proposals. BH was of the view that the presentation made to the Full Council at Five Ashes was sufficient to enable them to use the space they required.

MP ruled that they would revisit the definition, if the current plans and costings were made available.

ACTION DT

- 3.2. Mr R Nabavi asked the following questions, which it was agreed would be answered by the Parish Council outside the meeting.
- 3.3. I believe that the procedure for re-appropriating or disposing of the land, as it currently stands, is in fact very simple under the Local Government Act 1972. All that is needed is a resolution, an advert in two issues of a local paper, and consideration of any objections. It is easy to imagine some future Parish Council, or successor body, being forced to do this by central government or some planning authority desperate to build houses in our beautiful countryside, and this procedure doesn’t sound to me like significant protection. It certainly didn’t protect the Wig Wam playing fields in Northamptonshire. So my first question is, were SALC wrong to advise that there is significant procedural protection which applies to the land in its current status, and which is comparable to the very strong protection in law by Village Green status?
- 3.4. Secondly, the Council needs to consider protection against compulsory purchase. One of the great advantages of Village Green status is that it makes it virtually impossible for the land to be compulsorily purchased for development. This is because the acquiring authority would be legally obliged to provide an alternative piece of land of similar area. So my second question is, does the same statutory obligation apply to the land in its current status, or am I right in thinking that SALC were wrong in the advice they gave regarding compulsory purchase?
- 3.5. Mr B Pike asked if the Parish Council would take into account his letter of 2 October 2008 which suggested an extension of the conservation area boundaries to include Court Meadow and Herons Folly. The Clerk noted that this was scheduled to be heard by the Development Committee on 20 October 2008.

4. MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL HELD ON 15 SEPTEMBER 2008 (8C05)

- 4.1. Eight minor errors on matter of fact were accepted.
- 4.2. The suggestion that a matters arising sub-heading be included in the minutes was changed to observations and questions on the minutes to reflect best practice.
- 4.3. The minutes subject to the above were confirmed by the Full Council.

Observations and Questions on the minutes.

- 4.4. With regard to minute 8C05/7.1, in answer to a question from JB, the clerk confirmed that the discussion on the ESCC surplus land would be placed on the Development Committee agenda for 20 October 2008.
- 4.5. With regard to minute 8C05/21.4, in answer to a question from JB, the Clerk would take up the question of the decaying window frames with the butchers shop.

ACTION DT

- 4.6. With regard to minute 8C05/16.5, PA reported that he had been in contact with Sylvia Tidy with regard to street trading legislation. He expected to be able to report further at the end of the month.

5. MINUTES OF THE FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE HELD ON 29 SEPTEMBER 2008

- 5.1. The minutes of the meeting were confirmed.
- 5.2. CL noted that the minutes reflected many issues which were included elsewhere on the agenda. It was noted that the kerbstones at the Five Ashes War Memorial had been replaced by tarmac.

Observations and Questions on the minutes.

- 5.3. In answer to a question with regard to the path from the band hut to the car park it was noted that the path needed to be diverted so that it did not cause a potential hazard in the Memorial Hall parking area.
- 5.4. With regard to minute 8F05/14.3 JB asked whether the fireworks used for the bonfire parade celebration had been to approved standards. In reply it was noted that all bonfire societies used the same company who acted within laid down standards.

The Clerk was instructed to write to the Bonfire Society and obtain a copy of the standards and request that the noise be kept to lower levels. PA noted that it was necessary to keep the goodwill of the Bonfire Society and LM suggested monitoring the sound with a recording metre.

ACTION DT

6. FINANCE REPORTS FOR JUNE AND JULY 2008

- 6.1 The Finance Reports for June and July were discussed and approved by the Full Council.
- 6.2 It was noted that the results were in line with forecasts results, with lighting over budget because of work carried out earlier than anticipated.
- 6.3 The August and September results would be considered by the October meeting of the F&GP Committee.

7. REPORT FROM ESCC COUNCILLORS R TIDY AND C DOWLING

- 7.1. Councillor Tidy reported that:
 - East Sussex County Council was not affected by the Icelandic bank crisis, but Sussex Police were with £6.8 million invested there.
 - There was an advice programme designed to help small businesses in hard times, advice was free to firms with under 250 employees.

- It was noted that there was a requirement to increase the number of houses being built in the Wealden area, but there were no plans to increase the infrastructure requirements. This included strategic countryside gaps where existing protections will be removed.
- The amount of London waste which had to be accepted by East Sussex was likely to increase.
- East Sussex County Council had adopted corporate parenting, whereby each Councillor was responsible for those children in the council's care and be aware of the way they are looked after. ESCC was doing well at fostering, but noted that conditions were very difficult for adoptions.
- R Tidy paid tribute to the foster parents, who though paid provided really effective care.

7.2. DR asked about the A267 Mayfield roundabout where it was noted that it was sponsored by Roundwood Timber, but had not been landscaped. Winter planting was needed if there was to be a result by the spring. RT agreed to follow up.

ACTION RT

7.3. CD reported that:

- He would like to confirm the praise for foster parents in their commitment to the best interests of the children concerned.
- He had been working on traffic calming issues for Five Ashes.

7.4. PD reported his input on traffic issues in a personal report in Yellow Pages and noted little effective action in Five Ashes. The promised walk of the area for July had still not taken place. Highways appeared to be disinterested.

8. REPORTS FROM WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCILLORS, ROBERT STANDLEY, BRIAN REDMAN AND JONICA FOX.

8.1. RS reported that:

- WDC had no connection with Icelandic banks.
- He noted that much of the money in reserve was in short term investments whilst waiting to resource earmarked expenditure projects.
- Housing targets had been amended from 8000 to 9600, with a potential minimum target of 11500 with no extra funds for infrastructure.
- With regards to the budget the spending review had allowed for a 1.3% increase, with a known inflation rate of 3% which would have a big effect on the council's income.
- Progress on the Argos Hill Windmill Trust was continuing, and monies had been put aside for future match funding. It was hoped to be able to complete the lease to the trust in the near future.

8.2. JF reported that:

- Fuel poverty grants for improving insulation to dwellings were available.
- Electric blanket testing was to be carried out at a number of venues during October.

- With regard to affordable housing there was a re-examination of sites and a review of alternative sites. Shared ownership was being considered. There was a need to make progress on the programme since many sites had been mothballed but building will eventually re-start.
- WDC were trying to improve new developments, there had been some bad legislation which needed review, in particular with the provision of driveways.
- High Weald was holding a meeting on new developments which would lead into the associated councils. Small farms could be targeted for organic production, but again there were no infrastructure resources on offer.

8.3. BR reported that:

- Networkrail had turned down the Uckfield-Lewes railway restoration project on the grounds of viability. However the trackbed will be kept intact.
- There had been problems of Lorries using Old Lane and Victoria Road getting stuck.
- There was a project to offer opportunities for free swimming for the over 60's.
- Issues of heavy Lorries in the Eastbourne/Polegate triangle.

8.4. BR noted that there appeared to be a number of differences in the quality of affordable housing, and noted that standards varied. He compared a private affordable housing development in East Hoathly with the Raglan development at Frant.

8.5. With regard to the comments on the issue of Lorries at Victoria Road, it was considered that the provision of adequate signage would help solve the problems.

8.6. JF reported on the latest developments with regard to the ESSO garage site at Cross-in-Land.

9. MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD ON 15 SEPTEMBER 2008 (8P08) AND 6 OCTOBER 2008 (8P09)

9.1. An amendment to minute 8P08/4.5 was accepted.

9.2. Both sets of minutes were confirmed by UNANIMOUS VOTE.

9.3. PD noted that although the Parish Council had objected to application WD/2008/2188/F Minicot Cottage, this decision had been overturned by WDC. He considered it a poor decision and that case officers needed to be aware of physical situations as well as what the law stated.

9.4. LM commented that although it was considered that the Mayfield Grange cricket facility would be made available to all residents this was in fact not so.

10. TRANSITION MAYFIELD

10.1. The Chairman welcomed Ms Katie Treherne and two colleagues to the meeting to give a presentation on Transition Mayfield.

10.2. Transition Mayfield had been in existence for 18 months and had 14 members although many more turned up to its regular meetings.

10.3. The purpose of Transition Mayfield was to consider actions needed in the future to combat the effects of global warming and peak oil. Peak oil was the effect on people's lives as the global reserves of oil started to diminish. It was time to start thinking; there were many Transition groups in the county including Lewes and Tunbridge Wells in Kent.

10.4. So far the Mayfield group had been considering two issues:

- Food
- Energy

The food group was looking at ways of securing locally produced food and reducing the need to rely on outside transported sources.

The fuel group were considering alternative fuel sources such as wind, solar panels and energy from waste. In Lewes a company had been formed who could produce solar panels at much cheaper prices.

10.5. Catherine Swingland then gave a summary of the work of Caroline Lucas MEP on the launch of the East Sussex transition event.

Dr Caroline Lucas MEP, who sits on the European Parliament's influential Environment Committee and was voted 'Politician of the Year' by the Observer in 2007, will tell visitors to the East Sussex Transition Towns launch in Mayfield of the urgent need to address the increasing cost and approaching scarcity of oil.

She commented "The Transition Town network is the most exciting, most hopeful, and most inspirational green movement in Britain today. It is exciting because it's a fast-growing, direct, bottom-up response to an oil crisis which is already affecting us all.

"The Transition Town project proposes meaningful solutions to three of the greatest challenges we face today – peak oil, food shortages and climate change. It doesn't wait for government, politicians or corporation to act, it's about people in their communities taking action now, and joining together to create an alternative vision of how society could be."

In the current system of globalised trade, food production is dangerously dependent upon oil. She will warn that only by consuming more locally sourced food and services, and improving support for domestic producers, can we decrease our reliance upon unsustainable fossil fuels.

At the Mayfield event, Dr Lucas will highlight the positive message of the Transition Town network, which works to wean communities off fossil fuels, at a time when oil production may have already peaked and regularly surpasses the \$100-a-barrel mark.

She concluded: "Transition Towns demonstrates that the changes we urgently need to make in order to address peak oil and climate change are positive changes in themselves, allowing us not only to tackle the environmental crisis, but also to lead more fulfilling lives – through stronger local communities for example, better insulated homes, more vibrant local economies, more local production and consumption.

10.6. The group then asked for a Council representative to help with the work of the Transition Mayfield Group. The Chairman ruled that this matter would be put to the next meeting of the Development Committee for consultation.

ACTION DT

11. MINUTES OF THE COURT MEADOW ADVISORY COMMITTEE HELD ON 6 OCTOBER 2008

11.1. One minor error was accepted to the minutes which were then approved by the Full Council.

Observations and Questions on the minutes.

- 11.2. With regard to minute 8K03/6.2 JB asked why the Memorial Hall was refusing to pay rent. It was noted that a request for payment had been sent twice, it was considered to be in the best interests of the Memorial Hall Committee to pay the rent.
- 11.3. PD considered that the standing orders were out of date with regard to committee functions. He was informed that standing orders are currently being reviewed.

12. RESOLUTION 8C08

- 12.1. The following Resolution was debated:

That the Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council resolved to ask the Court Meadow Management Committee to consider whether the Parish Council should instruct the Clerk to apply for 'Village Green' status and protection for all or part of Court Meadow, and if so define which parts of Court Meadow should be included in the application.

PROPOSED BY COUNCILLOR J DRISCOLL

SECONDED BY COUNCILOR J BRAMWELL

- 12.2. JD opened the debate by stating:

I was disappointed that the Court Meadow Management Committee (CMMC) was not asked to give its opinion on Mr Nabavi's proposal to protect Court Meadow with Village Green status. I also felt that the whole Parish Council should vote on such an important issue.

I am extremely grateful therefore, both to David and Martin our Chairman, to be given the opportunity to ask you to vote on this Resolution. It would allow the CMMC to research and debate more fully the Village Green issue. (An important part of this process would involve contacting other Parish Councils owning Village Greens, so we can learn from their experience.) The Committee would then present its findings to the whole Council for further discussion before a vote is taken.

I recognise that this Council would not ride roughshod over the wish of the community and develop even a small part of the Meadow. However there is no protection for the Meadow at the moment that guarantees that the land will not be disposed of or developed in the future, irrespective of the wishes of future Parish Councils.

From the research that I have undertaken myself, I believe that registering Court Meadow as a Green would give it the bonus of protection against development whilst allowing the Council to own and administer it as normal without any outside interference. The CMMC may see fit to disagree, however I would like to explain to you what my research has found.

- It costs nothing to register land as a Village Green although legal advice may need to be sought. This however has already to a large extent been done. William Bennett, the Council's solicitor, confirms that registration is possible.
- The Parish Council would continue to own and administer Court Meadow as they do now. No administrative duties would be imposed on the Council as a result of Registration.
- Court Meadow would have greater protection and as far as we can see would also retain any existing protection that it has under the original Compulsory Purchase – we are awaiting confirmation on this point from the P.C.'s solicitor. At present all land can be compulsorily purchased. However where land is registered as a Green (under s/6 Commons Act 2006) exchange land of a similar size and type would have to be given. The clerk is under the impression that PPG17 would give Court Meadow the same protection from development as would Village Green status.

Legal advice that I have received from the Open Space Society says that this is not the case. PPG17 is Guidance only, not law. Prior to the 1980s it was possible to appeal to the Secretary of State when a playing field was threatened with development. However the Local Government Act 1972 has now been amended by a 1980 Local Government Act and there is now NO appeal. Advice that the Clerk has received from SALC on this appears to be misinformed. All that happens is an advertisement is placed in the local paper for two weeks. The Council then considers the responses and is able to act in whatever way it wishes.

- Anything that is for the 'better enjoyment of the Green' would be permitted. The Skateboard Park and the Basketball Court should fall therefore within the provisions of the protective legislation (s29 Commons Act 1876 and J12 Enclosure Act 1857). An offence is only committed where any encroachment is made other than with a view to 'better enjoyment of the Green'. The provision of facilities (e.g. a sports pavilion) to assist in the enjoyment of recreation is not in breach of those sections.
- One off or temporary events such as the Fair, MMM or the Church Fete would be permitted and could demand an entrance fee. However, as a Green is to be enjoyed by all by right, there could be no permanent charges for entry.
- East Sussex refers to 'unlawful sports' as not being allowed on a Village Green. The Open Space Society's legal advisor states that this is rather outdated C19th legislation, mostly to do with cockfighting, which would no longer affect us. Nowadays it would be the restrictions imposed by Health and Safety laws and those imposed by our insurers that would influence our decisions.
- Finally, it would not be difficult to separate as a Village Green, the recreational area from the village amenity area (at the top end) if Registration was thought to be desirable.

You may dispute some of these assertions of mine. However please allow the CMMC to investigate them so that together we can make the right decision for the future of Court Meadow.

12.3. CL considered that the facts and supposition did not present a problem and saw no need to revisit the Village Green proposals, and RF and LM confirmed that research at this stage did not present a need to revisit the F&GP decision.

12.4. PD stated that the Chairman had asked him to respond to the debate, because of interest issues, where he himself had nothing to do with the original decision.

He acknowledged the contribution of RN to the Village Green debate, and the proposition to reconsider the F&GP decision. The problem was that the Village Green status would hamper possible long term management decisions and once made there was no way back. It was not possible to foresee the needs of a generation hence.

The SALC advice indicated that sound management and the existing protection, together with improvement of facilities were sufficient.

The way ahead was shared commitment, within the democratic framework of the Parish Council. The Parish Council was not a debating society, and the decision made by the F&GP had been unanimous and was binding on the whole council, and for the F&GP committee to manage on their behalf. At any time in the future a fresh set of values, laws of the land and simple local issues may determine that something afresh should be considered for Court Meadow future. It is recommended that it should be brought forward for debate once every four years i.e. within the life span of each council.

12.5. The resolution was put to the Full Council for decision:

FOR	2
AGAINST	10
ABSTENTION	<u>1</u>
	<u>13</u>

The resolution was lost.

13. REPORT OF THE YOUTH COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 24 SEPTEMBER 2008

13.1. This was deferred.

14. MINUTES OF THE SECURITY MEETING HELD ON 16 SEPTEMBER 2008 8S03

14.1. There were no amendments to the minutes, which were approved by the Full Council.

14.2. No questions or observations were raised.

15. PARISH PLAN – AFFORDABLE HOUSING

15.1. DR opened the debate by stating that Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council have always been very proactive in helping our parish to recommend affordable housing for our own residents. In approximately 2002/3 we suggested a number of sites in the villages that could be developed for affordable housing but 5/6 years later they are just starting to come to fruition.

The Development Committee presented a plan, earlier this year, for the next 20 years, to the Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council, which was agreed by the Full Council.

Within this plan is the recommendation for future development that within Mayfield and Five Ashes 30% of the dwellings are affordable and that such dwellings are pepper potted around new developments to mix in with the developments that are happening within the village.

We are now in the situation that 2 new ‘select’ developments are being planned (one already nearly finished); in the first the Planners have agreed to the developers’ request to allow no affordable houses on site as they will devalue the rest of the development. To overcome the affordable housing rules the first developer has offered to pay approximately £300k to Wealden for use in supplying affordable houses on other sites within the Mayfield/Wealden environs. This equates to approximately 3 dwellings. The second planning application is to combine two areas of development in the village but only to put affordable housing on one of these sites. This site being the Maintenance Yard in the conservation area of the centre of the village. This Maintenance Yard will then have seven affordable houses and three freehold properties situated in the centre of our historic conservation area adding to all the cars and parking problems that we are all so aware of.

What I am asking my fellow councillors are their views on whether we are happy for this to go ahead or whether we fight to follow the submitted Parish Plan that you have all agreed to. How can we ensure that the contents of our Parish Plan are reflected in the decisions made by our Parish committees and our District Council?

- 15.2. CL was of the view that there would always be an element of conflict between WDC and the Parish Council, and that whilst the Parish Council would support the plan completely; this did not necessarily mean that Wealden would buy in to each and every action.
- 15.3. BR noted that within the Local Development Framework the Parish Plan is taken into account, but particularly in planning applications the highest standards were not always followed and that in some cases as little as possible was spent. Parishes needed to be aware of this and challenge where necessary.
- 15.4. PD did not agree he considered:
- In the case of St Leonard's sites it was a question of gaining a consensus, which he believed had been achieved.
 - Mayfield Grange was a buy-out.
- There was a need to compromise because that is how things are achieved. He accepted the criticism.
- 15.5. DR noted that the Parish Plan would need substantial review at least once every five years; this was agreed by PD and HH.

16. REPORT FROM ARGOS HILL WINDMILL REPRESENTATIVE

- 16.1. JD reported that progress was being made in forming the trust for the windmill, but she did not think that she should be a named trustee, but remain a representative.
- 16.2. It was agreed that the trustee should be the Parish Council as a corporate body, but before a decision could be made it would be necessary to study the trust documentation.

17 REPORT FROM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE REPRESENTATIVE

- 17.1 PA reported that James Gallifant had made a website presentation to the Chamber of Commerce.
- 17.2 The next meeting was 20 October 2008, where street trading would be discussed.
- 17.3 Work on updating the village directory was taking place.

18 REPORT FROM MAYFIELD COMMUNITY CENTRE REPRESENTATIVE

- 18.1 JB reported that comments from 350 visitors to the recent exhibition were being analysed, and that plans and costings would be reviewed within the month.
- 18.2 It was reported that the 'My Place' application had not been supported by ESCC. The funding application was for up to £2m.
- ESCC had decided to support a Hasting project instead. It was noted however that there was no limit to the number of applications which could be made. However the application date had now passed and other funding methods would need to be considered.

19 REPORT FROM TRAFFIC COMMITTEE

- 19.1 PD asked for items for the agenda for the forthcoming Traffic Committee meeting on 22 October 2008.
- 19.2 PD reported that news on forthcoming 20 mph zone for Mayfield was in the October edition of Yellow Pages.

20 REPORT FROM RIGHTS OF WAY COMMITTEE

- 20.1 JB reported that there had been 17 objections to the proposed diversion of FP13 and that the Rights of Way Committee had objected. JB was unable to attend the meeting of WDC Development Committee North.
- 20.2 It was also difficult to use the legal path because of the harassment caused by the landowner's dogs, but it was clear from recent complaints that the conditions of the ESCC judgement had been broken, and that it was proposed to progress this matter with ESCC.
- 20.3 The Parish Council gave its full support to the committee's efforts to take this matter to a conclusion.
- 20.4 The landowner's database had been completed.
- 20.5 There had been a working meeting with the ESCC Rights of Way Department.

21 REPORT FROM THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

- 21.1 There was no report from the Development Committee.

22 DOCUMENTATION

- 22.1 With two minor corrections the Child Protection Policy for Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council was adopted by UNANIMOUS VOTE.

23 CLERK'S REPORT NOVEMBER 2008 8X06

- 23.1 The Clerk's report was taken as read. There were no comments.

24 ITEMS OF INFORMATION AND NEXT AGENDA ITEMS

- 24.1 PD asked whether the letter on FACTS had been sent to Mrs Ciggs. The Clerk confirmed that the letter had been sent.
- 24.2 JB reported that the welcome to Mayfield sign on Newick Lane had been damaged.
- 24.3 DR asked if the rubbish could be cleared away from under the roundabout on Court Meadow.

THE MEETING CLOSED AT 2220 HOURS.

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE MAYFIELD AND FIVE ASHES PARISH COUNCIL WILL BE:

VENUE: MAYFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

DATE: 10 NOVEMBER 2008

TIME: 1900 HOURS