



Bracklesham Barn, Beech Avenue, Bracklesham
Bay, Chichester, PO20 8HU

Telephone: 01243 673588

Enquiries@eastwitteringbrackleshampc.org.uk

**MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 10th SEPTEMBER 2020 AT 7.00PM VIA
ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE**

EWBPC COUNCILLORS

PRESENT:

Brian Reeves (BR)

Becky Salamon (BS)

Richard Ford (RF)

Pamela Kensington (PK)

Doug Holden (DH)

Emile Kott (EK)

Susan Taylor (CDC Councillor) (STT)

Pieter Montyn (PM) (WSSC Councillor)

Elizabeth Hamilton (EH) (CDC Councillor)

Emma Cox (EC)

Joe O'Sullivan (JO'S)

James Salamon (JS)

Dawson Parker (DP)

Darren Banks (DB)

APOLOGIES:

Graeme Barratt (GB) (CDC Councillor)

IN ATTENDANCE

Parish Clerk and 5 members of the public

20.55 Declarations of Interest and dispensation requests

Councillor Holden had requested a dispensation for matters pertaining to the Bowls club of which he is a member on the grounds of representing the interests of persons living in the area. The dispensation was granted.

20.56 Minutes of the Council's Meeting Held on 9^h July 2020.

The minutes were agreed as a correct record and *approved* for signature.

20.57 Update on actions from previous meeting

Completed

20.58 Public Questions

None had been submitted.

20.59 District and County Councillors reports

EH – GB had previously circulated a copy of the CDC members bulletin to the council. EH thanked the council for preparing the position statement on planning.

STT – The two government consultations on planning are open for comments – the first on the white paper *Planning for the Future* outlining new primary legislation and the second detailing proposed changes to the current system, which can be enacted via secondary legislation (via a statutory instrument or Minister's announcement). The proposed changes to existing law are a concern. The new algorithm for allocating housing numbers is based on the district boundary, not on the planning authority boundary, so will include the national park and would cause a demand for more housing in the area – it also takes into account house prices within the national park which will further increase the housing allocation as affordability is a factor. West Sussex is one of the worst impacted areas in the country. A

letter has been sent to the local MP urgently asking her to raise the matter and support the local community. The MP for Arundel (Andrew Griffith) has made a speech in the House on this issue and its impacts upon West Sussex. 995 new dwellings per year is currently indicated by the new allocation algorithm which is impossible to deliver.

CDC will be discussing the issues next week and are submitting a robust response. They are encouraging the parishes to lodge similar responses.

JOS asked what was the likelihood of the proposed changes being made? – STT could not say how likely or not it would be, but the situation could be perilous.

PM – WSCC are not the planning authority but will be discussing this at their council meeting next week and are hoping to pass a motion to ask the government to reconsider the changes. Land unavailable for development also includes the AONB as well as the national park, further limiting the land available for development.

WSCC is trying to manage the COVID 19 pandemic as well as normal services and this is having a huge impact upon budgets so they are looking at how this will impact future services.

WSCC are focusing on preparing for the winter and a likely second wave. A new testing centre has opened in Tangmere. Schools are now back, so WSCC are closely monitoring this and any impact it may have.

The local economy has been badly hit – nearly 25% of the working population have been furloughed. As this unwinds it may cause a problem.

Costs of adult care are rising and number of children in care has risen sharply as a result of the pandemic and increased domestic violence.

Preparations are also taking place in the event of a no deal Brexit – this will impact on trading standards, highways (traffic backing up from Portsmouth), supplies and also our large European national population.

Cllr Holden joined the meeting at 7.21pm

20.60 Reports from Parish Councillors on Meetings attended since 09/07/20

BR gave an update on planning meetings held.

The Village Hall committee have met and are currently opening for the pre-school service only.

BR attended an MPP meeting. The Environment Agency gave a presentation on planning – BR will circulate to the council. Only one part of the national coastal path has currently been passed. Coastal erosion at Earnley is being worked on.

JOS -requested that he attend the all parishes meeting on 16/9/20

20.61 Finance

20.61.1 The Chairman had agreed and signed the bank reconciliation.

20.61.2 The council received a statement of the current financial position and budget monitor.

20.61.3 The council received the list of payments made between 01/07/20 and 31/08/20 totalling £21,180.31.

*Council **RESOLVED** to ratify the bank reconciliation, finance reports and payment schedule.*

20.62 **Planning Position Statement**

A draft statement outlining the council position on new developments sites and applications that may come forward now that the local plan had lapsed had been prepared.

*Council **RESOLVED** to adopt the planning position statement and to send a copy of it to all adjoining Manhood Parishes, to the senior planning policy officer at CDC and to the Local MP.*

BR asked council to consider what made a community and how we could plan for the development of the community over the future. He proposed that we send the statement to the local MP and invite her down to discuss how new housing could actually deliver what we need rather than just housing units. Finally, the settlement hub boundary is not the same as the parish boundary – this needs to be addressed as it has a material effect upon the number of units that are allocated to us.

STT – this was raised last year when the SP Broadway development came forward in Church Road and the response from the planners was that the hub boundary did not have to align with the parish boundary.

BR would like to see the scoring scheme for CDC in allocating settlement hubs – STT recommended contacting Toby Ayling for clarification on this.

Action: Clerk to write to local MP raising our issues re planning and development.

Action: Clerk to contact Toby Ayling for clarification on scoring scheme for allocating settlement hierarchy.

20.63 **To consider the budget reforecast for 2021/21 and the likely budget implications for 2021/22**

The COVID-19 crisis and enforced closure of the Barn for six months had caused a significant drop in income and would continue to have knock-on effects into the next financial year. Ongoing uncertainty had led the Clerk to take a pessimistic view of likely resumption of normal levels of activity.

In addition, the Parish Council was anticipating taking on responsibility for funding the mobile household waste service from WSCC from March 2021 and CDC have asked for an increased contribution to the community warden costs to help cover some of their COVID-19 budget losses.

The Clerk highlighted that both CDC and WSCC have benefitted from direct government grants to help with the increased costs of the COVID crisis and were also eligible to apply for the government local authority income loss compensation scheme to cover 80% of the revenue lost from commercial activities. The Parish council was not eligible for either of these schemes and so was being asked to pick up additional costs for higher tier authorities whilst at the same time absorbing 100% of the losses in income from trading activity (e.g. hall hire).

This meant that the forecast was for a deficit of -£17K this year rising to -£45K next year. Assuming that no assistance is passed down from the higher tier authorities to the parishes,

this will require a precept rise of approximately 30% in 2021/22 to balance the books.

WSCC have asked the Manhood parishes to confirm by the 11th September if they are still willing to take on the mobile waste costs (£11.5K) per year given the radically altered funding position since this was first agreed in March 2020.

Councillors expressed the view that the HWRS was highly valued by local residents and it would be a pity if it had to be cut. Council asked if there was an option to bring the service back at a later date if the funding situation changes in the future. The Clerk confirmed that this was not possible due to the nature of the WSCC contract with Viridor.

The Clerk was asked if a reduction in service (e.g. limited facilities as at present) would lead to a reduction in the fees charged – WSCC councillor Pieter Montyn agreed to ask this question urgently of the officers at WSCC.

Finally, the Clerk was asked if an extension to the decision deadline could be made. The Clerk agreed to request this but asked the council for direction in what their decision would be if an extension was not possible. Council agreed that if more time could not be made available, then we should no longer agree to take on funding of the service.

CDC have asked the parishes to confirm by 17th September if they are willing to take on the increased costs of funding the District Senior Warden (£2.5K) by 17th September. The local warden was already co-funded by the parishes and CDC have now asked the parishes to contribute to the district-wide post of senior warden who manages the entire warden team as they are looking to save administration costs as a result of the COVID crisis. The council noted that CDC have received central government grants to help with their additional COVID costs and could reclaim 80% of their lost income, neither of which schemes were available to parish councils meaning that we were currently absorbing 100% of the additional costs of COVID and 100% of the income losses.

On this basis, council did not agree to the funding request

The council agreed to look at other areas where it may be possible to reduce or cut expenditure. These included the events budget as we were unlikely to run many major events next year due to the COVID situation.

Christmas Tree Lights – this budget could potentially be cut from next year. Cllrs. RF & EK agreed to try and find sponsorship for the Xmas lights so that they could be maintained at their existing level for 2021.

The chairman advised that the Neighbourhood Plan budget could be cut, given the likely changes to planning and uncertainty surrounding the future of the neighbourhood plan process.

Over the last two years the Parish Council have invested considerable sums in delivering Youth services and funding a team of youth workers. This could be potentially cut if we need to make further savings, although it would be hoped that this could be avoided if possible.

Cllr JS asked if we could put on commercial events to raise income, although this could be risky with the COVID crisis so uncertain. Council agreed to investigate ways in which income

could be generated in order to avoid cutting services and to reduce the need to unduly increase the precept.

Council **RESOLVED** to request an extension from WSCC and if this cannot be granted by EOP 11/09/20 to withdraw from the agreement to fund the mobile HWRS.

Council **RESOLVED** to decline to contribute to the senior warden post from 2021.

Council **RESOLVED** to form a working party of EK, RF, EC, DB BR & DH to look at how additional income could be raised.

Action: Clerk to advise WSCC of their decision pending a response to the request for further time.

Action: Clerk to advise CDC that we will be unable to contribute to the senior warden post costs.

Action: Clerk to arrange meeting of income generation working group

Councillor Montyn and Councillor Taylor left the meeting at 20.07

20.64 Skatepark Feasibility Study

The Chairman thanked Cllr Ford for his work in preparing a feasibility study detailing the business case for developing a skatepark at Downview Recreation Ground.

The existing tenants at Downview had been asked for their comments on the feasibility study and submitted written responses which are appended to these minutes.

Cllr JOS asked the following questions:

- 1) Assuming skatepark goes ahead, how much would the PC have to contribute towards it what is the contribution that they want us to make now?
- 2) Who will benefit from it? Evidence is that skateparks are mostly used by males aged under 30 – should we be looking at facilities that would benefit a wider group of users?
- 3) What is the support from within the parish rather than the wider area?
- 4) What additional resources are there in the parish to take it forward?

Cllr DB Was concerned about the views of the Woodger Trust on the project as they are a potential funder.

RF responded to the initial questions:

- 1) At this stage there is no financial commitments needed from the PC for at least 10 years – all initial maintenance costs will be incorporated into the project and raised via fundraising activity, not via the precept.
- 2) Who will benefit? Anyone who uses a scooter or skateboard will have access to the facility and could benefit from it. Skating is very democratic and has few barriers to participation.
- 3) Local postcodes – Cllr EK advised there are 620 responses from PO20 postcodes. Cllr

PK asked if information could be provided on the number of respondents from PO20 8 postcodes as those were relevant to the parish.

- 4) The Woodger Trust were approached for an initial meeting but the project never went any further at that time. A range of funders would be approached to raise the funds for the project.

Cllr RF proposed that the parish council resolve to establish a working group to look further at the idea of a skatepark, to plot a way forward and draw up an ITT for approval by full council to appoint a contractor to take it forward.

Cllr JS thanked RF for the work in preparing the document. And expressed his support to for the project and to investigate what could be delivered and to improve local facilities.

Cllr EK thanked RF for his work and asked that members that wished to be involved visit some facilities to see what is possible, how well they are used and how positive they can be for a community.

DP thanked RF for his work on the study and asked who will be responsible for the insurance costs for the first 10 years? Cllr RF responded that this will be covered via the initial fundraising activities to ensure that the first 10 years costs are raised.

Cllr DP Asked how often do they have to be refurbished and what is the estimated lifespan of a skatepark? What are the likely maintenance costs in the short and long term and what are the decommissioning costs? RF responded that this information that he would be provided in in the final recommendations for any designs that are proposed.

Cllr PK Affirmed that she supported the principle of developing a skatepark but was not certain that Downview is the right space for it. Before we go to tender stage, we need to be clearer on exactly where on the field it will be built, how much space will be needed, and what is being proposed. More consultation is also needed at this stage with local residents to ascertain that a Skatepark is genuinely wanted before we go any further.

Cllr JOS – The feasibility study quoted various figures for the delivery of a Skatepark but we need to have a realistic project budget in mind before we can go any further. We also need to look at a bigger picture and how this will fit in to a wider masterplan for the village – this needs to be built into a better narrative of a wider vision for the community.

Cllr EK – Appreciated that this is a large task and this is why we need to engage a professional organization at an early stage to look at what people want and what is needed/acceptable.

Cllr BR – Part of the process required in the ITT will be handling of public consultation with a wide group of community representatives, including younger people, older residents, etc. The contract will also include requirements for 10 year maintenance, etc.

Cllr DH asked how skateparks normally operate – is it open all the time? Cllr RF confirmed that it is like a play park it will be accessible at any time day or night.

the final location, the size/scope of the skatepark, the design and the project costs.

*Council **RESOLVED** to establish a working group consisting of DH, PK, JOS, RF, BR, EK and the*

Clerk to develop the project further and draw up an ITT for approval by full council.

Action: Clerk to arrange meeting of Skatepark working group

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL WILL BE HELD THURSDAY 8th OCTOBER AT 7PM MEETING VIA ZOOM.

These minutes are in draft form until approved by the council at the next meeting and may be amended by resolution. Copies of all unapproved minutes, agendas and more information about East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council can be found on the Parish Council's web site: www.ewbpc.org.uk

Signed _____ Chair

Date _____

Summary of Actions

Minute number	Action	Person Responsible
20.62	Action: Clerk to write to local MP raising our issues re planning and development.	Clerk
20.62	Action: Clerk to contact Toby Ayling for clarification on scoring scheme for allocating settlement hierarchy.	Clerk
20.63	Action: Clerk to advise WSCC of their decision pending a response to the request for further time.	Clerk
20.63	Action: Clerk to advise CDC that we will be unable to contribute to the senior warden post costs.	Clerk
20.63	Action: Clerk to arrange meeting of income generation working group.	Clerk
20.64	Action: Clerk to arrange meeting of Skatepark working group	Clerk

Summary of Responses to the Skatepark Feasibility Study From Key Stakeholders

Woodger Trust

Dear Sam,

As I have another Zoom meeting at 7.00 pm on Thursday, I cannot join the PC's meeting. Typical, don't have a meeting for months, then two together!!

Last week, Brian (Reeves) sent me an email telling me about the Feasibility Study and saying "if you want to discuss it with me so I can put your views forward please give me a call".

This morning, I spoke with Brian and made the following points.

1. Page 21 of the Study includes the words "that the trust likely to fund the skatepark is against this location". The Trust has never been asked to contribute towards the cost of a skatepark, and has never discussed the matter. I have been told that, some years ago, a former trustee may have met members of the Wittering Skate Park Group, but what may have been said was never reported to the Trust.
2. At the time the decision was being taken to construct what is now Downview Hall and the car park, the Trust made it clear to the Parish Council and the Wittering Skate Park Group that it would only fund the construction if it received assurances that a skatepark would not be built on the Downview Open Space. Trustees believe they received those assurances, and do not know why both the Council and the Group are now proposing Downview as the preferred site for a skatepark.
3. The Trust's principal objection to the location of a skatepark adjacent to Downview Hall is the potential noise nuisance. The Feasibility Study frequently mentions siting skateparks at least 60 metres from residential properties. In my opinion, Downview Hall should be treated in the same way, with any skatepark being at least 60 metres away from the Hall.

Best wishes

Bowls Club

1) From President, Witterings and District Bowls Club.

I am suitably informed that when The Woodger Trust built Downview Hall they agreed to provide car parking for the sole use of the Hall, Football Club and Bowls club and the Parish Council were advised accordingly.

Why then, is this proviso being ignored once again, with the assumption that it is available for use by the skateboard fraternity?

2)

THE WITTERINGS & DISTRICT BOWLS CLUB
Downview Close Stocks Lane East Wittering PO20 8NS

Sam Tate – Parish Clerk
East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council
Bracklesham Barn
Bracklesham Bay
Chichester
PO20 8HU

8 September 2020

Dear Sam

Skatepark Feasibility Study - Proposal to move to Invitation to Tender (ITT)

Thank you for your recent email in connection with the above.

As you are aware the Covid-19 pandemic has put many restrictions on all our lives and we, at the Bowls Club, have had no Committee Meetings for many months and we have had no time or opportunity to discuss this matter further. However, having considered this skatepark proposal in the past we are still of the opinion that Downview Park is not a suitable site for a new skatepark.

Our original objections still stand:

Insufficient car parking. As you know the car park is now well used by Downview Hall, W&D Bowls Club, the footballers, children playground, dog walkers, wheelchair users, etc).

Noise, nuisance, security, vandalism and other antisocial behaviour concerns. (Quiet, secluded area could give rise to more drug abuse, users equipment, needles, broken glass, additional litter, etc.)

The Downview Hall is used and was built, primarily, for use of children and some are of a very young age. Therefore, safeguarding of youngsters could become a greater concern.

No toilet or First Aid facilities are available.

In an emergency, there are no public telephones nearby.

We were surprised to see that on Page 7, (Identifying need), that the Bowls Club is not listed as an outdoor pursuit for individuals and families. Also, there is no reference to children's playgrounds.

Would it not be beneficial for the Parish Council to ask the Residents of the Parish to express their opinion on this proposal before the Parish Council is asked to provide more funds for the project?

On Page 8 reference is made to signatures from PO19 (Chichester) and PO21 (Bognor). Surely, we should have the opinions – support or otherwise - from our own Residents before asking other areas.

We do not understand the comment on Page 17 where it states that - "The site is protected by the local bowls club". How? The "Girl Guide Hall" is actually Downview Hall.

Please note that we at the Bowls Club do not need to speak at the meeting on the 10 September but would like to be included in the Zoom link.

Kind regards

Hon. Club Secretary
The Witterings & District Bowls Club
3) Downview Hall

Dear Brian

Thank you for your email regarding the Parish Council meeting on Thursday, sorry it has taken a while to reply I have been going through the old paperwork.

Here are my comments with regard to the feasibility study for the proposal of a Skatepark at Downview.

My response to page 17 :-

During the planning application for Downview Hall WSCC raised concerns about the capabilities of the car park coping with another facility on top of the existing busy football club and bowls club. As the Parish Council knows the car park was built by the Woodger Trust specifically for those three facilities and not as a public car park. The Council will already be aware that during a normal summer the car park is fully utilised by these three facilities.

In the study the car park is described as "informal parking" what does this mean?

The building may shield local residents from the noise but it would be disturbing for many of the groups that use the Hall.

The building is not a Youth Centre, Youth Club hire the hall 1 evening per week during term time, it is a Community Hall used by many different groups, of different ages which include Yoga classes, Carpet Bowls, Dance classes, Slimming World as well as Rainbows, Brownies, Guides and Rangers with Girlguiding and Scouting having Pack Holidays and Sleepovers at the Hall for children aged 7 years and above throughout the year.

The noise would be very disturbing for many of these groups as it is for local residents and also the anti-social behaviour associated with a Skatepark, there are frequent incidents of broken glass, alcohol bottles, drug packets and condoms found at the Skate ramp as it is out of sight of passing vehicles and pedestrians which makes it an ideal location for this behaviour. When this has been mentioned to the Police they said it was impossible for their vehicle patrols to see the ramp without getting out and walking to it.

It is because of the above that the Parish Council and Skatepark group agreed not to continue with Downview as a site hence it was excluded from the Parish Council survey (minutes around June/July 2017).

Page 21- "utilities"? what is meant by this? There are no public toilets nearby.

I have also attached a letter from Girlguiding which was a reply sent to Emile back in September 2017 when he approached them for comments.

Can you please read this email out at the meeting and also the letter from Girlguiding.

Unfortunately i have another Zoom meeting booked for 8.00pm on Thursday but i am hoping to join the Parish Council meeting at some point. I am happy to answer any questions.

Thank you

On behalf of Downview Hall, Trustee for Girlguiding

Copy of original response from Girl Guides :

11th September 2017

Dear Emile

I have been forwarded the e-mail that you sent to Girlguiding HQ regarding the concerns that you have raised regarding the new youth club building in East Wittering.

Whilst we fully appreciate the need to develop a range of facilities for all to use in East Wittering it is part of the agreement between The Woodger Trust (funding the hall build) and the Parish Council (leasing the land) that the skate park is not built next to the new hall.

Before building began on the hall the Skate Park committee signed a document stating that they would not pursue the request to build on Downview Park. On the 9th May 2017 the following e-mail was sent to The Parish Council:

Dear Joyce,

No one involved with Wittering Skate Park Group would have anything to do with jeopardising the building and running of the new Youth Club at Downview Park. We will only pursue locations that are supported by East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council and we wish the Girl Guides every success in this new location and congratulate the Woodger Trust in developing this fantastic facility for all our community.

Regards

Nick de Candole

For and behalf of Wittering Skate Park Group

It is my understanding that The Parish Council have set aside money to investigate other possible venues for the skate park in the local area and have presented your committee with a list of 5 or 6 possibilities for your consideration. I understand that The Parish Council are expecting your thoughts on these at their meeting on Thursday.

I hope that one of these alternative locations work for you as I think we all agree, that we are all striving to provide a great range of facilities for local people.

Yours Sincerely

County Commissioner

Girlguiding Sussex West