

# Wisborough Green Parish Council

## Draft Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting to be agreed on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2018

Date: Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> February 2018

Present: Mr N Beresford (NB), Mr A Burbridge (AB), Mr K Charman (KC), Mr P Drummond (PD) (Chairman), Mr A Jackson (AJ), Mr M Newell (MN), Mrs S Overington (SO), Mr M Watson (MW)

Apologies: Mr H True (HT)

In Attendance: Mrs L Davies, Clerk

Members of Public: 12

The Chairman opened the meeting at 7.45 pm and welcomed all.

Action By

1. Apologies for Absence: Apologies were received and accepted from Mr True.
2. Declaration of Members' Interests: Being a resident on the west side of the Green, MN declared his interest in item 5a, the Sports Pavilion. No other interests were declared. Mr Beresford entered the meeting room at 7.53 pm and declared no interests.
3. Minutes of the Last Meeting: The Minutes of the last meeting held on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> January 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
4. Public Questions:

A School Road resident attended the meeting to hear Parish Council discussion relating to the new Pavilion and asked for clarification on the following points:

- *Whose responsibility was it to discuss with neighbouring property owners about the nature of the proposal?* The Chairman advised that as part of the planning process, Chichester District Council (CDC) would advise neighbours directly.
- *Apart from the first consultation last February, had provision been made to consult more widely with the community as changes to the plans were presented at the last meeting?* The Chairman advised that the Parish Council had been involved in discussions since improving facilities had first been considered and the community had been consulted on plans in February 2017, with further updates being provided in Parish communications and recorded in Parish Council meeting minutes. He reminded that CDC was the planning authority and would ultimately give consent to any plans; any subsequent changes would require further planning permission. AJ advised that the Parish Council was the landowner and granted the Lease. Building could not commence until a new Lease had been agreed, and this was for Parish Council consideration. It was the expectation that once the Parish Council was comfortable with the proposed plans, a planning application would be submitted to CDC. Having obtained planning permission, grant funding could be sought but there would be a period of time post planning which would allow non-material amendments to be made.
- *At any stage has alteration, refurbishment and extension been actively considered for the present building?* The Chairman advised that prior to plans being presented to the Parish Council at the meeting in February 2016, consideration had been given to upgrading the current building. However, it was agreed that the building was beyond economic repair, was not fit for purpose and the needs of the Association had expanded; the Parish Council had supported a replacement building.

### 5. Planning:

- a. New Sports Pavilion – building, future management structure and Lease: The Chairman reminded of discussion at the January meeting, and the questions posed by the Sports Association were displayed; these would be addressed during discussion. He advised that he would permit public participation on points for clarification, if requested by members.

New Pavilion: PD handed over to AJ who presented details of the latest plans, giving explanation to the general proposal, new location and internal details. Plans of the earlier iteration were displayed along with an overlay of the new design; AJ highlighted the rotation and slight dimensional changes. Roofline details were displayed and explanation given to the potential impact upon the vistas from the playground. He highlighted that the artist's impression of the glass element showed the building unpopulated; the view through would be obscured by the kitchen/bar element and seating. PD also highlighted that this would be further obscured by the shutters, which would be down more often than not.

*In relation to the roofline, Mr Gadd (Sports Association) advised that a topographical survey had now been undertaken and as such this would drop the building by 0.25m at the car park end and a full 0.5m on the glass element.*

AJ explained that the Parish Council was required to take planning considerations into account:

Access

Physical – size / height / bulk / visual impact / finishes

Location – effect on surroundings and public vistas

Conservation Area context – complimentary / sensitive

Impact / loss of public recreation space

Neighbourhood Plan – provision of facilities for the community and sustainable (would have for a long period of time and long term benefit for the village)

AJ gave an explanation of the previous location and the new proposal's impact upon the views from the playground extending quite significantly across the Green; the roofline would have an impact upon the view of the church and would obscure other lower buildings. AJ confirmed that vistas were important for the general public as well as residents.

AJ observed that the main building had increased in size (4 bays increased to 5) and that the single storey was slightly deeper but with a reduced width. In terms of the internal layout, many of the facilities had been provided which was reported as relating to Sport England and other sports body's requirements. AJ displayed a chart that demonstrated the facilities being provided in recent planning applications around the district, highlighting that this accommodation was quite substantial, with a large provision for floor space and seating. AB stated that he understood the changing facilities were the minimum requirements able to accommodate minors. AJ advised that the Parish Council would need to consider if this plan was too much or whether this was futureproofing the building.

AJ made a comparison to the plans presented in February 2016 and posed the following questions to the Council.

Access: Limited change.

Physical: Larger than presented previously. Is this acceptable?

Location: Close to the previous location but did extend into the centre of the Green having a significant effect on the public vistas.

Design: Was this sensitive for the Conservation Area?

Impact / loss of public recreation space: Footprint had increased, but it was a two storey building – was this acceptable?

Neighbourhood Plan; The provision of better facilities was identified in the Neighbourhood Plan and would potentially have increased benefits for several sections of the community.

Is it sustainable? Is it a bit too much or is it right for the village? Could it be smaller?

Was it necessary to have the separate meeting/bar spaces?

Could the location/angle be changed to mitigate some of the visual impact?

Could the location be rotated/moved closer to the west road?

The Chairman thanked AJ for the presentation and invited members' comments.

Having knowledge of the design process through his involvement in the Sports Association, AB advised that the different clubs, Parish Council, District Council and members of the public, all had different requirements, and after much discussion, the design now presented was the optimum to provide the necessary facilities. When plans were previously presented to the Parish Council, members were supportive and, in fact, he was quite surprised that the Parish Council had liked the modern design, giving the Sports Association the direction to speak further to the sports bodies and CDC. One of the changes had been to reverse the orientation of the proposed building, which was a CDC suggestion, and had less of an impact on the Green by the very nature of the location and design.

Reversing the proposal, having the glass element further onto the Green, had less of a visual impact than the original proposal, being just 3m high; it was previously more than double this height. A larger bar area had been included as this was necessary to generate funds to allow the Association to be viable and successful. It was felt that on a summer's evening it would provide a valuable facility for the community to enjoy and generate income. So far, the Sports Association had spent £15,000 on planning fees.

MW advised that he liked the design and questioned whether it was actually large enough to futureproof the building.

SO advised that she had been positive about the first design but not at this location.

The Chairman confirmed his general support of the design but had concerns over the scale in relation to the Green, the bulk and how the building divided the Green. Not only could the Parish Council offer opinion but it also had a statutory duty to ensure that it was the correct proposal for the community; it must be right as the build could not be reversed. He acknowledged that the concept to futureproof the building was correct, the community was growing, but he did have concerns that a corner of the Green was in effect being cut off and the issue of vistas was important. Members of the community appreciated these views on a daily basis and views were a general fact of wellbeing. He appreciated the amount of work that had already been undertaken, but as with the Village Hall, sometimes it was necessary to have a re-think to ensure the right decision was being taken.

The Chairman noted that the first proposals had a 7.2m high building, which blocked off much more of the view. Although this had been raised as a concern, the Sports Association was supported by the Parish Council to continue with the design process. The new plans showed a 20% increase in floor space although the bar area reduced from 90 to 80 square metres. The storage space had been increased from 30-45m square metres. The biggest change related to the floor footprint due to changing room requirements. He liked the design, but in relation to the vista, he questioned whether the building could be smaller. The design provided well for physical space and facilities, so was this a bit too much or was it futureproofing the building if this was the village's vision.

AJ expressed his concern that a bigger building was, in effect, cutting the Green in half and would change the look and vistas; it was currently an open area that was envied by many other communities. The new design had increased the size of the building from 1896 to 2835 square metres, about a 15% increase. It was making a division on the Green. The Chairman asked whether the Sports Association could obtain guidance on a different orientation and size.

AB displayed an aerial photograph with the 2016 plan superimposed. He advised that the ridge height of the 2018 design had been reduced from 7.5 m to 6.8 m. The design had been reversed and with the fall of the ground, the Sports Association believed that there would still be sight of the full church as currently. The 2018 proposal in effect opened up the critical view as the roof height of the glass element was 3 metres instead of 6.8 metres.

AJ explained that the first plan had been quite high and he was pleased that this had now been reduced. He was aware that CDC had requested that the tree be retained and protected. However, he asked whether the design could be rotated and the angle of the glass element reduced to lessen the impact upon the vistas, but still allowing appreciation of the whole effect.

KC advised that he did like the design, although disliked the scoreboard arrangement. He supported the principle of a new building that would be better than the current and commended the Sports Association on the work to date and the close liaison with the Parish Council. AB advised that the score board had been softened and reduced in height to address previous comments.

KC advised that the Parish Council had not had the benefit of pictures previously and agreed with comments in relation to the mass of the building in this position. He agreed with AJ's comments and also questioned whether there was any technical reason why the building and glass element could not be eased around to reduce the impact on the vistas. The Parish Council had previously agreed to deal with parking and he therefore asked if there was scope to re-position and reduce the size if moved across into the parking area. PD concurred and asked if the orientation could be changed.

SO highlighted and read from Policy EN4: Conserving and Enhancing the Heritage Environment and also Policy EN5: Local Green Space, page 41 and 42 in the Neighbourhood Plan. For consistency, it was important that the Parish Council applied Neighbourhood Plan policies to this proposal. AB concurred that it was important to reference the Neighbourhood Plan but it was how it was interpreted; the Parish Council did not have an issue in 2016 with the height and vistas. AJ advised that the Parish Council did not have the same degree of information at the February 2016 presentation and the physical model was not in context within the Green. There had been several iterations considered since initial discussion; one originally being behind the current building. AB made reference to the February 2016 minutes and the strong steer from the Parish Council that it supported the design. AJ highlighted that throughout initial discussions with the Sports Association, the Parish Council had always stressed the importance of vistas.

The Chairman invited Mr Gadd to address the Council in relation to the orientation and size of the building. *Mr Gadd advised that the building could be moved towards the car park if there was capacity to extend the current parking/turning area to accommodate the 5 cars, the current provision needed to meet WSCC Highway requirement (no loss of parking). The score board had been positioned to face the square, although alteration was potentially possible.*

In advance of the meeting, the Clerk had circulated the Open Space Society and Defra Guidance regarding the provision of parking on a Registered Village Green. Members noted that the car park amendment to provide the same provision was not losing amenity space at the edge of the Green and therefore should be considered. Living on the west road, MN highlighted that parking along the road was still an issue, particularly in the summer months with cars being parked between the trees. He questioned whether the use of the building should be expanded if the parking situation could not be resolved. It was agreed that there was potential to use the space behind the building if this allowed it to be repositioned, and losing the edge had less of an amenity impact than the centre. A layby along the Kirdford Road edge had also been considered in the past.

*Mr Gadd advised that local people generally walked or cycled to the Green for weekend fixtures.*

*Mr Gadd agreed to look at using an area at the rear of the building for parking to allow some rotation on the building.*

SO expressed her concern in relation to the change in concept, from a sports pavilion to a commercial enterprise. She highlighted that the Parish Council had always impressed that the provision should not be in direct competition with the public houses, cafe and Village Hall, which were valuable community assets. She felt that the proposals were changing the use and balance of the facility and wanted to ensure that the new Lease provided for effective and assured management, and communicated how potential issues, such as noise, would be resolved. She believed that there were four strands that should be addressed: change of concept, design and use of the building, views and vistas/character and Conservation Area, and public consultation. She gave details from a statement she had prepared. She felt that it was imperative the Parish Council received full details of a business plan prior to giving further steer to the Sports Association.

*Sports Association Question 1: Will the Parish Council fully and actively endorse and support the plans?*

Members requested that the Sports Association re-visit plans with the architect and provide a revised design; location to prevent physical cutting of the corner, reduced angle of glass element, reduction of rear entrance canopy, retaining vistas, review scoreboard location.

*Sports Association Question 2: Will the Parish Council support the Sports Association in fundraising activities and in allocation of 106/CIL money?*

Members agreed that the Parish Council would support fundraising activities. Although the Parish Council might contribute some CIL funding, the Council was unable to commit any funding at this stage, beyond possible parking improvements, due to other projects that were in the pipeline, such as traffic management.

*Sports Association Question 3: Will this be the Council's priority development?* Members were unsure of this question's intent. Members agreed that there were a number of projects being considered in the village at the present time, such as traffic/road safety, the Village Hall, Winterfold open space and all were equally important for the village; as was the Pavilion. *Mr Calder-Smith, Cricket Club Chairman, advised that this question had been posed to get an indication of Parish Council support to assist with fundraising activities.*

New Lease: The Chairman advised that the current Lease expired in 7 years and in order to obtain grant funding and give security for the proposal, the Sports Association had requested a longer Lease.

Sports Association Question 4: *Will the Parish Council support a new lease? The current lease is too short for grants to be given. Preference for a 99yr lease with a minimum of 50.*

SO understood this need, but felt that it was important for the Parish Council to have sight of a business plan to ensure that the required safeguards and controls were in place.

AJ explained that he was a Councillor when the previous Lease was drawn up and was supportive of a new Lease. He was pleased that there was now greater connection and communication with the Sports Association and that previous management concerns appeared to be an issue of the past. He believed that setting up a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) was appropriate. The current Lease provided for Trustees with the formal control responsibility being delegated to a committee. New Trustees would need to be responsible for the day-to-day running of the building and use, and manage behaviour and impact. Previous concerns related to the understanding of personal liability, but if Trustees acted within good faith, there was no personal liability. An interim arrangement may be required during construction but this was detail that could be discussed later.

The Chairman explained that with a CIO, statutory duties were imposed and the Charity Commission required an annual monitoring report. The Lease would be quite specific although the role of a Trustee was set out by the Charity Commission. All things being considered, and the wording being agreed, PD suggested that a 99 year lease was appropriate if the correct safeguards were in place.

KC agreed that if established properly, charitable status was the correct decision, but it was important to future proof the system to take account of changing personalities. The Trustee board would need to be objective and have independence.

License:

Sports Association Question 5: *There may be a requirement to clarify the license to play sports on the green, the right to schedule fixtures and the right to repair certain parts of the green alongside the lease.*

It had previously been acknowledged by both the Parish Council and the Sports Association that the Green was under pressure from the many activities. The Chairman explained that in 50 years' time, Wisborough Green was likely to be a larger village but hopefully with the same character and heart. He suspected that cricket would always remain on the Green, but there was a possibility that football might be accommodated elsewhere. Consideration was already being given to increasing facilities with the inclusion of a junior cricket pitch on the Winterfold open space. It was therefore necessary to plan for all eventualities, but providing the license was necessary to give security of tenure and aid fundraising.

Sports Association Question 6: *Will the Parish Council support the potential to raise revenue through the letting out of premises for commercial and recreational use?*

SO expressed her concern that this could put the Pavilion in direct competition with existing businesses and other premises. KC concurred, reiterating that from the outset, the Parish Council had stated the building should not compete with other facilities.

*Mr Gadd advised that the Pavilion would not be providing food, apart from perhaps hotdogs, unless it was a specific function. This had already been discussed with the publicans of The Cricketer's Arms and The Three Crowns. Both premises lacked the facilities to cater for a wedding or larger event, and both had expressed interest in possibly hiring the new pavilion for an event, however, Mr Gadd acknowledged the competition with the Village Hall. It was envisaged that the Sports Clubs would probably hold their annual events at the Club rather than taking the business outside the village. Yoga classes could be held in the upstairs function room, possibly with refreshment facilities being made available.*

SO highlighted the direct competition with the Village Hall, as did PD with the café. *Mr Gadd advised that they had not spoken to the café.*

The Chairman was concerned that the proposal appeared to be for commercial letting and suggested that more details for the predicted future use of the top room be provided. *Mr Calder Smith advised that the use was linked to the longer-term viability of the building. Being able to divide the top room would also allow the space to be used for therapies in support of sport, recreation and health. Maximising the benefit of the top room space would achieve a small amount of income currently not being achieved by the building.*

The Chairman requested that the Sports Association worked up ideas setting out the heads and some of the details of the activities currently foreseen as potential uses to enable the Parish Council to confirm that the proposal would not prejudice other village organisations and facilities. AJ highlighted that this was potentially running a business from the village green, which he personally felt very uncomfortable about. KC and SO concurred, advising that this potentially contravened Acts protecting the Green.

SO asked how the charitable status would work with the commercial element. *It was explained that the charity would focus on the provision of sporting activities and any money raised would be spent on sport. The commercial activity, probably the bar, would be an independent and separate entity, which would have the ability to donate to the charity. AJ expressed his concern that a third legal entity was being created to account for this. Mr Newman, Cricket Club Secretary, advised that there were elements outside the scope of the charity and any surpluses would be distributed to the charity. The exact details had yet to be established.*

**Licencing Restrictions:** The Parish Council had previously stated that the bar would not exceed the restrictions imposed on the public houses, with no late night drinking permitted. *Mr Gadd advised that the timing would remain unchanged. It would be a members only bar and Temporary Event Notices would be obtained, as necessary. AJ felt that the Parish Council would be keen that a restriction on the use of the deck area be included in the Lease.*

**Sports Association Question 7:** *Will the Parish Council support the proposed change to the Sports Association Structure?* Members were supportive in principle to the change to a CIO but further details relating to the commercial element would be required.

Being involved in a charity, a member of public gave explanation to the strict controls that were in place and the Charity Commission requirements. She also stated that community consultation was important and since the February 2017 consultation, the plans had changed and as such, members of the community should be informed. *Mr Gadd advised that he had booked a space in the next parish magazine to provide an update. However, he noted the comments relating to the close neighbours and would provide details prior to the application being submitted.*

It was agreed that SO's notes and the minutes would be forwarded to the Sports Association so that the requested information and amendments could be provided.

12 members of public left the meeting room.

- a. **Planning Applications:** The following applications were reviewed. Application details and plans had been circulated in advance of the meeting and were also displayed:

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant and Details</b>
WR/17/03457/DO M - Case Officer: - Beverley Stubington - <b>Other Dev - Householder Developments</b>	Mr Jonathan Stern Albion House Petworth Road Wisborough Green RH14 0BH Construction of single storey side and rear extension. O.S. Grid Ref. 504854/125887 The Parish Council had no objection to the extension, however, as the Parish Council supported dark sky policies, it recommended that the lantern was provided with blinds or other means of controlling light pollution.

WR/17/03458/LBC - Case Officer: - Beverley Stubbington - <b>Other Dev - LBC's                  Alter/Extend</b>	Mr Jonathan Stern Albion House Petworth Road Wisborough Green RH14 0BH Construction of single storey side and rear extension. The Parish Council had no objection to the extension, however, as the Parish Council supported dark sky policies, it recommended that the lantern was provided with blinds or other means of controlling light pollution.
---	--

6. WSCC Proposals for School Signage Improvements: The Wisborough Green school and governors had approached WSCC seeking some signage and lining changes to support the journey to and from school during term time. Information had been circulated in advance of the meeting and was displayed. Although members were anxious to ensure road safety, all felt that the proposals were unsuitable and out of keeping for a Conservation Area in a rural village, making the following comments about the specific proposals:

- New pedestrian build out proposed on Durbans Rd: Members felt that the build-out would create a physical barrier and restrict use of the layby as a parking area; parking was already under pressure in the village. A Community Highways application was currently being considered by WSCC and was a more desirable scheme to improve the walking to school route.
- New illuminated SSZ East-bound on Newpound Lane. This was the only lane in the village and members felt strongly that an illuminated sign was out of keeping for the rural area.
- New illuminated SSZ south-bound on School Road. Again, members felt that this was too urban for a Conservation Area.
- Replace existing school sign in Newpound Lane with illuminated SSZ and face West bound traffic. Again, inappropriate and unnecessary, potentially confusing.
- School Keep Clear markings on eastern side of School Road o/s rear school entrance: Members were aware that since the school building work, parents had been encouraged to use School Road as a dropping off area rather than the front entrance. The provision of keep-clear markings would potentially restrict use of this entrance for drop-off, which appeared to have been working well. This proposal was potentially superseded by new arrangements, but justification and clarity on what was intended was required. It was noted that the markings at the front of the school should be re-painted.
- New S5 School sign at Southern end of Durbans Rd: Members felt that this sign would not be seen being set back from the road, potentially obscured by parked cars, and so close to the junction with driver attention elsewhere; it would be further street clutter in the Conservation Area.

Clerk

7. Durbans Road Speed Reduction: Members were disappointed to receive communication from WSCC advising that the speed data collected to support that application demonstrated that average speeds ranged between 26.5mph to 41.5mph, with four out of the six survey results exceeding the maximum average speed (32.9mph) intervention level defined in the Policy. Consequently officers could not promote a 30mph speed limit for Durbans Road. Members reviewed the speed data and assessment summary. It was known that other speed limits had been reduced on roads where it was unlikely that the maximum average speed was under 33 mph. As such, Clerk to write to WSCC to express disappointment and to request speed data for these roads through Halnaker and the A29, between Coldwatham and Watersfield.

Clerk

8. Any Other Matters to Report: The Clerk reminded members of next week's meetings:

- Monday 12<sup>th</sup> February – 10.15 am – Village Hall Lease Meeting (PD/KC/Clerk)
- Monday 12<sup>th</sup> February – 7.00 pm – Traffic Management Plan (PD/KC/SO/Clerk)
- Monday 12<sup>th</sup> February – 8.00 pm – Finance Committee Meeting (PD/AJ/KC/MN/Clerk)
- Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> February – 10.00 am – Winterfold Open Space (PD/AB/KC)
- Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> February – 10.00 am – Bench Inspection (PD/Clerk)
- Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> February – 2.30 pm – Toilet Review Meeting (SO/Clerk)

Date of Next Meeting: Parish Council Meeting on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> February 2017 at 7.45 pm.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 10.05 pm.

.....  
Chairman

.....  
Date