

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

The annual **LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING** was held at King Edward Hall, Lindfield on **THURSDAY, 28 April 2016**, chaired by the Chairman of Lindfield Parish Council, Mr William Blunden.

**Present:** Lindfield Parish Councillors: Mr W Blunden (Chairman), Mr. M. Allen, Mr. A. Gomme, Mr. S. Henton, Mr. S. Hodgson, Mr. R. Pickett, Mr. R. Plass, Mr. C. Snowling and Mrs. V. Upton.

Councillor Mrs. C. Field (WSCC)  
Mr. P. Desmond  
Approximately 18 members of the public

**Apologies:** Parish Councillors Mrs. M. Hersey and Mr. S. Shortland  
Councillor Mr. A. Lea (MSDC)

**In attendance:** Mrs. C. Irwin (Clerk, Lindfield Parish Council)

The meeting commenced at 8.00 p.m.

In accordance with the statutory duties under the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12, paragraphs 15 (1) and 11 (1), the Chairman of the Parish Council, Mr. W. Blunden had called the meeting and now presided at the meeting. The notice and agenda, duly signed by the Chairman and dated 18 April 2016 had been displayed on the Parish Council noticeboard since 18 April and had been available on the Parish Council's website since that date.

## 1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION BY CHAIRMAN, COUNCILLOR MR WILLIAM BLUNDEN.**

The Chairman welcomed all those present to the meeting and announced the emergency procedures for the King Edward Hall. .

## 2. **MINUTES OF THE PARISH MEETING HELD ON 30TH APRIL 2015.**

The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Parish Meeting held on 30 April 2015. These were **AGREED** and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as being a true record of that meeting.

## 3. **COUNTY COUNCILLOR'S REPORT: COUNCILLOR MRS CHRISTINE FIELD.**

Councillor Mrs. Christine Field reported on the work of West Sussex County Council as follows:

"I try to keep the 4 Parishes within my County Council Division up to date with WSCC matters throughout the year and to respond to issues raised with me by local residents. Much of the regular reporting is dominated by highways matters: responses to the traffic implications of housing developments, complaints about the road surface – usually potholes and requests for measures to alleviate traffic speeds, congestion and parking. This is partly inevitable as virtually every resident uses the highways and footways daily.

But there is much more to the work of the County Council and I would like to highlight a little of that.

Over half of the annual budget of just over £500m is spent on adult social services, supporting people to live independently in their own homes for as long as they can and guiding them in to residential care if necessary. We have one of the fastest ageing populations in the country with a predominance of people over retirement age and one of

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

the highest percentage of over 85s anywhere in the UK. I think it is fair to say that West Sussex is a good place to live! We struggle to find enough places in which to care for people once they become frail and have pledged £35m to help to strengthen the care market.

At any given time, we have around 650 children in the care of the Local Authority and an equal number placed in foster and residential care within our area by other LAs – mainly London Boroughs and Brighton and Hove CC. WSCC is responsible for the safeguarding of all these vulnerable children – a task which has taken on a new profile since the scandals of Rotherham. The work extends to protecting all of our young people from all forms of exploitation, especially sexual, and is a major priority. As part of the Think Family initiative, our staff work intensively with the most disadvantaged and troubled families to help them to order often chaotic lives and improve the life chances of all. The work of our staff in dealing with the causes and consequences of domestic violence has been given a new profile of late c/o The Archers!

Currently we still play a major role in the provision of education and the allocation of school places. The day to day management of schools is facing major reform under the recent White Paper [*re Academies*], but whatever happens, we shall retain the responsibility for ensuring the proper provision of school places for all of the children in the County, and we are called upon to act in the interests of our residents as with the recent decision to close the Central Sussex College Campuses in Haywards Heath and East Grinstead, which will leave many of our young people needing to find alternative places to study for A level and vocational qualifications.

The Fire and Rescue Service does not stand alone, as in many areas, but is an integral part of the County Council. Apart from fire-fighting and prevention and assisting at road traffic accidents the staff also work closely with local people, helping those who may be becoming isolated and lonely as a consequence of age or disability, fitting smoke alarms and providing advice which helps to protect them, most notably from the modern scourge of the 'scam'.

Despite funding reductions we have tried to maintain 'frontline' services. We continue to provide a full range of library services, adapting them to modern needs. We also continue to run a Meals on Wheels service, which delivers hot meals 365 days of the year at a cost to the customer of £4.60 – delivered to the door and served.

In my own area of responsibility we are working to bring health and social care ever closer together to provide a more effective and 'seamless' service. Through Public Health we not only provide the information needed to plan other future services, but also provide school nurse and health visiting as well as a raft of health education to help everyone lead healthier, longer lives and reduce our reliance on professional health care. This includes sexual health services (to help reduce teenage pregnancy) drug and alcohol treatment services, smoking cessation and weight management courses and support.

In an ever more challenging financial environment, we are always looking at better and more cost effective ways of doing things. This now includes the possibility of devolution funding and powers from Central Government. Through the 3SC [*Three Southern Counties*] project, we are exploring ways in which East and West Sussex and Surrey may be able to work together. This work embraces all 26 County, District and Borough Councils across the area and whatever the outcome, whether we secure a deal like Greater Manchester and others or not, it does seem certain that we shall be co-operating much more closely with other Councils and other agencies, especially the Health Service, in the years ahead.

This is not a comprehensive list of services, I have not mentioned the thousands of tons of waste which we either dispose of or re-cycle each year, nor the countryside maintenance

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

and many more services which rarely catch public attention, but I hope that it has given you a broader flavour of the role which the County Council plays in the lives of all of the population and where your Council Tax is spent”.

## 4. DISTRICT COUNCILLORS' REPORT.

Councillor Mrs. Margaret Hersey had submitted a written report on behalf of her fellow Ward Councillors on Mid Sussex District Council, none of whom were able to attend this meeting, as follows:

“We have had an interesting year with a new District Councillor settling in and existing Councillors ensuring that the Lindfield Ward is truly represented with all the pressures from outside.

On planning, which is such an important subject to Lindfield, we are still awaiting the Birchen Lane appeal decision.

We successfully managed to convince other committee members that the application for 200 homes at Scamps Hill was wrong and it was refused.

All councillors wait with anticipation the approval of the District Plan as it is only then that we can truly see the worth of our Neighbourhood Plan which received overwhelming support at the referendum and was successfully “Made” in March 2016 by MSDC and forms part of the development plan for the District”.

## 5. PARISH COUNCIL REPORT: COUNCILLOR MR WILLIAM BLUNDEN.

“Once again this has been an interesting and challenging year for your Parish Council. We welcomed our new Responsible Financial Officer, Mrs. Tracy Ely to the Council following the resignation of Sue Kolien who had served the Council for 20 years. We started the year with an uncontested election, having received only 10 nominations for 12 places. We welcomed Councillor Judy Durrant onto the Council and said goodbye to Michael Amor, Jane Chatfield and Roger Pickett who had all made a contribution to the wellbeing of the Council. Advertisements were placed for these two vacancies and Mrs. Liz Hinze and Mr. Stewart Shortland came forward and were co-opted onto the Council at an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council on 9 June. Unfortunately, due to personal reasons, Mrs. Hinze found it necessary to resign from the Council and we would like to take this opportunity to thank her for the contribution she made during her time on the Council. The casual vacancy was advertised and Mr. Roger Pickett was co-opted back onto the Council as he has a wide range of skills which have proven to be of great assistance.

The most noticeable challenge for the Council was the upgrading of the WSCC streetlights. The lack of consultation and the poor communication and work methods of their contractor gave the Parish Clerks and Councillors plenty of headaches from distraught residents. We are still awaiting completion of the lights which are being converted to heritage style, but a representative of the contractors met with the Clerk last week and now has a list of the outstanding work, which hopefully will be done in the near future.

Due to the lack of a District Plan and a five year land supply, Developers are taking this opportunity to test the Local Authorities by making unwelcome planning applications such as the Birchen Field site, Walstead and Scamps Hill sites. This is particularly disappointing as local Town and Parish Councils have all been working very hard to produce their Neighbourhood Plans; the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural plan went to referendum on Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> January and received a resounding yes vote with 95% of those who voted. The next stage was for it to go to Mid Sussex District Council for the plan to be “made” which happened on the 24<sup>th</sup> March. The Neighbourhood Plan is meant to represent the views of local people as to where development etc. should go in their particular areas.

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

As with most other local government bodies, the real work of the Parish Council is done in standing committees, of which we have three.

The Chairman of the Finance and General Purposes Committee is Stephen Henton with Ron Plass as his Vice Chairman. This Committee's main purpose is to keep the Council in a sound financial state, together with the Responsible Financial Officer.

The Chairman of the Planning and Traffic Committee is Alan Gomme who is very dedicated to this role and serves the Council well; it is through his hard work and dedication that the Neighbourhood Plan got through the Referendum. Simon Hodgson is Alan's Vice Chairman.

The present team is completed by myself as chairman of the Environment and Amenities Committee assisted by Val Upton as my Vice Chairman, who is also the Vice Chairman of the Council. Val is one of those people who are unable to say no when anyone asks for volunteers, one day she will learn to remain silent.

As always the past year has presented the Council with challenges but a number of achievements could be reported. The Minutes of the last year reveal how busy the Council has been, particularly the Planning and Traffic Committee and the Environment and Amenities Committee.

## Planning and Traffic Committee.

Together working with colleagues on the Lindfield Rural Parish Council, the Lindfield Neighbourhood Plan has been made. Councillor Alan Gomme who chaired the Working Group and gave up so much of his time in bringing this to fruition will perhaps now start to get his life back. If anyone has any questions on the Neighbourhood Plan, I'm sure Alan will be able to answer these under item 8.

The Council is represented on the local liaison group which monitors the activity on the Barratts/Wates site in Gravelye Lane, ensuring that all of the planning conditions are adhered to.

The Council has commissioned a Traffic Study of the village as there are several areas within the village that have given our residents a lot of concern. Our Consultant has analysed accident and speed data from the last eleven years and we are expecting a written report shortly.

The Council has also given support for the Lindfield Preservation Society's application for a Traffic Regulation Order to restrict lorry movements in central and north Mid Sussex which has been submitted to West Sussex County Council.

The Council has also submitted responses to MSDC on planning matters including larger developments in Scamps Hill and Birchen Lane as well as every individual application in the village.

## Finance and General Purposes Committee

A total of £1,200 in grants has been awarded during the 2015/16 year, to support organisations whose work has benefits locally.

We are still actively working on the project to replace the toilets on the Common which were demolished by MSDC in 2005. There will be more about that under item 6.

The F&GP Committee has thoroughly reviewed our budget and reserves over the last year and the council agreed its recommendations on the Budget and Precept for 2016/17 in

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

January. The budget is £183,580 and we have increased the Precept by £5,000 to £157,000. This is the first increase since 2009/10 and it is less than 3½ %, adding just £1.57 to Band D Council Tax for the year. The F&GP Committee also has responsibility for the Parish Office and last year arranged for the clock in the tower to be refurbished and fitted with an automatic control mechanism to reset the time after power cuts and British Summertime changes.

The Environment and Amenities Committee has achieved a number of objectives for the benefit of the village, the main items being:

- Repaved the area between the Butchers and the Post Office corner and added additional bollards.
- WSCC Street lights upgrade – the Council has paid £13,143 for the heritage upgrade
- Replaced all of the Parish Council's street lights in Brookway - £9,625 to our contractors and a further £17,305 to UK Power Networks
- Enhanced the Christmas lights in the High Street
- Christmas Festival Night was a huge success thanks to the work of our Deputy Clerk and the Working Group.
- Arranged six refuse freighter visits to the Tollgate car park
- Negotiated with Haywards Heath Town Council about maintenance jobs to be done as paid work, (including cleaning seats, litter bins and bus shelters and painting of pond posts and seats)
- Taken part in discussions about the proposed Lindfield Primary Academy footpath and improvements to the dog waste bin service.
- Continue to organise the Village Spring Clean, which has been much better supported over the last couple of years – nearly forty people turned out for this year's Spring Clean a couple of weeks ago, despite the weather not being all that good".

## 6. PROPOSAL FOR THE REINSTATEMENT OF PUBLIC TOILETS ON THE COMMON.

The Chairman introduced this item and invited Councillor Ron Plass, as a member of the Working Group, to give an update and speak about the information displayed at this meeting. Councillor Plass gave a brief explanation about the history, the proposal and the process.

In 2005, MSDC had made the decision to remove the toilets by the bowling green and the ones in Denmans Lane, along with others in the District. The Parish Council had taken the opportunity offered in respect of the Denmans Lane toilets to take them over and invest in their improvement. These facilities had now been run successfully for several years. Since the demolition of the toilets on the Common, the Common had become increasingly busy with greater footfall. The need for toilets was noted in the Village Action Plan in 2006 and in 2010 the Parish Council had conducted a simple poll to ascertain whether residents wanted them reinstated. The result gave the Council the confidence to formalise this as a project.

An extensive review of potential sites had been carried out: 17 in all. Outside professional bodies had been consulted as well as MSDC, in order to achieve acceptability in terms of the standards expected of modern facilities. Design consultants had worked on designs during the year and the Parish Council now had a design, costs and a preferred site. The Council would be setting up the display on Village Day and the whole purpose of the informal consultation at this stage was to gauge people's response and then work towards a village vote. Councillor Plass emphasised that this was not a done deal. If the vote produced a negative response, the project would die. 51% would be considered a positive response and at that point the formal applications would be made through the normal planning process, when there would be opportunities to object. The final hurdle would be to

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

seek approval from the Secretary of State under the rules regulating works on registered common land.

Mr. A. Mackenzie spoke against the proposal, as the owner of the house adjacent to the preferred site and on behalf of other residents in the immediate area. He first expressed appreciation for the clarity of the displays and scale model which included his house and thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to express his views. The points made by Mr. Mackenzie to support his objections included:

- close proximity to his house, within earshot of the doors and spoiling peaceful enjoyment of his property as enshrined in law
- constantly in view particularly for 1 Backwoods Lane
- adverse effect on value of his property
- lack of natural surveillance - it would fall to residents to report incidents and antisocial behaviour and seek help; no confidence that the police would be able to carry out frequent surveillance
- antisocial behaviour
- there had been continuous anti-social behaviour in and around the building before the previous toilets had been demolished and it had been known for needle-drop (shared hypodermic needles had been hidden in cisterns) - communal urinals would host such behaviour;
- the area behind the proposed new building was likely to be used for urinating when the facilities were not open
- light usage had been quoted by MSDC as one of the reasons for closure of the original toilets
- the toilets in Denmans Lane were relatively close to the Common
- being boxed in to a single site location was not acceptable
- there was no evidence of the need for 4 cubicles

Mr. Mackenzie made the suggestion that it could be looked into as to whether the cricket, tennis and bowls club toilets could be made available to the public. He concluded by stating that 100 people had signed a petition objecting to the plan and supporting a proposal that the Parish Council should drop the plan to avoid anxiety for residents.

Mr. N. Kerslake spoke against the proposal in the following terms:

- it was difficult to understand why the Parish Council was pursuing this project as there was no clear and identifiable evidence of demand, need and usage
- MSDC had stated that in the 10 years of there being no toilets on the Common there had been no problems or complaints and during the life of the previous facilities there had always been low usage as evidenced by beam counts
- the Parish Council could have refurbished the original toilets if it had expressed an interest before they were demolished
- sporting groups used their own facilities and for large events portable toilets were brought in, otherwise people could use the ones at Denmans Lane or the King Edward Hall
- there was no evidence of people urinating in the open
- usage associated with children's playgrounds was low because the length of stay was fairly short
- there was no justification in terms of cost for service and maintenance which would be costly for the tax payer; a full refurbishment would be needed every 5 years
- this level of cost was only justifiable in town centres because of high footfall
- this would be a white elephant and waste of money; the project should be stopped immediately and not reactivated unless there was quantitative evidence of need.

Mr. D. Wood-Allum, a resident and a Public Recreation Planner, stated that he understood the needs of people using the Common and believed that access to public toilet facilities

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

was a good thing but had objections to this particular proposal and offered some suggestions for consideration:

- the scale of the development as proposed was too large
- it was difficult to understand why the Parish Council was going from “no loo to super-loo” which seemed to be using a sledge hammer to crack a nut
- the cost and the ongoing expense for maintenance and refurbishment would be very high, factoring in for vandalism and unforeseen costs.
- why did the Council only choose one site and one which was so far across the Common, without offering a choice?
- The Council’s evaluation criteria were excellent, but there should be an options appraisal
- the prospect of children running across the road to the toilets would be manslaughter waiting to happen
- the Parish Council should take the opportunity to look at other options with less risk and a smaller building
- a single multi-sex cubicle on the side of the publicly funded cricket pavilion would suffice
- would like to see the technical reasons why building toilets next to the Cricket Pavilion were not an option.

Points made by Mrs. A. Guthrie included:

- she had called the police at least 5 times in the last 14 years for disturbance (drinking, fighting, bad language, intimidating and even threatening behaviour. The toilets would attract more of this
- concern about the open area behind the proposed building which would be screened from view
- the proposed site would mean crossing the road twice with cars frequently parked on both sides; the other side of the road would be a better location
- if the toilets were indeed needed, they should be put on a less dangerous site

Other points made by residents included:

- groups of teenagers gathering at the toilets would be intimidating to young children
- the proposed site was too far from the playground – younger children would not reach it in time
- a resident of Backwoods Lane
- the area behind the proposed site was remote
- concern that the memorial hedge would be vandalised – Mr. Browning of MSDC had given assurance that there were no plans to put toilets back on the site, so this had seemed to be a suitable place for the hedge and plaque
- there were enough toilets in the village
- as well as antisocial behaviour the toilets would afford opportunities for child molestation and bullying etc, the risk of which could not be discounted
- Backwoods Lane was a busy road; a 20mph limit was only in place during school hours and a crossing patrol at arrival and departure times
- people would be forced to walk right past the toilets in the proposed location as there was no footway on the other side of the road; this would be intimidating at night, particularly if there were concealed areas
- the Parish Council could look into a Community Toilets Scheme, such as that which was in place in Haywards Heath, whereby MSDC paid Costa for use of their facilities. The Cricket Club might be attracted by the money to provide an attendant in their building during fixtures.

The Chairman and other members of the Council made a number of points in response to those raised by residents:

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

- the Council was trying to represent the needs of the whole village
- some shrubbery alongside Old School Court had had to be removed as it was being used as a toilet
- when Councillors marked out the proposed site a number of people had stopped to comment, with only one negative response
- the toilets at Hurstpierpoint were no more than 5 metres from houses
- individual cubicles with no open area would discourage antisocial gatherings
- use of the King Edward Hall facilities for the general public would not be practicable: the hall was a community building and hired out for events such as wedding receptions and there would be safeguarding issues because of the nursery school in operation on weekdays
- the outside area would be designed and planted with shrubbery to deter access to secluded areas
- the toilets would be locked at night
- the cricket club extension for which planning permission was in place did not allow room for public toilets; use of their indoor toilet was understood not to be possible because of safeguarding issues in respect of the playgroup which hired the premises
- consideration of sites had been a judgement call in all cases: there were legal restrictions in terms of Commons Act regulations and a suggestion of using the site on the other side of the car park had been judged to have too great a visual impact
- the number of cubicles had been influenced by examples seen elsewhere and would cater for high activity days, with a gents urinal and more cubicles for ladies
- funding for the capital project was available from the sale of the former Parish Office in Denmans Lane and from Section 106 Developer Contributions which would have to be returned to the developers if not used within a specified time.

## 7. FAIR TRADE: PRESENTATION BY RESIDENT PETER DESMOND.

### “Personal Introduction

Good evening. My name is Peter Desmond. Thank you for inviting me to speak at this meeting about the possibility of Lindfield becoming a Fairtrade Village. I have lived in Lindfield for three years and am a member of All Saints Church.

### What is Fairtrade?

Fairtrade is a kite mark that is applied to a variety of products. The Mark means that the products have been produced by small-scale farmer organisations or plantations that meet Fairtrade social, economic and environmental standards. Examples of countries involved are Columbia (bananas), Tanzania (coffee) and India (cotton).

The price paid by the consumer includes the payment of the Fairtrade Minimum Price which means that, however low world market prices fall, the producer organisations receive enough to cover the costs of production and a sustainable livelihood. It also includes an additional Fairtrade Premium to invest in business or community projects.

### What Products are Fairtrade?

There are over 4,500 Fairtrade certified products in the UK. They include coffee, tea, chocolate, bananas, pineapples, green beans, oranges, lemons, rice, cocoa, orange juice, apple juice, wine, honey, marmalade, sugar, jams, roses, nuts, spices, pasta, dried fruit, cakes, biscuits, cotton, beauty products, gold, platinum and silver.

To be recognised as a Fairtrade Village, it is not necessary for all of these products to be sold or used in the village. Fairtrade goods are already sold in Lindfield particularly at the Co-operative Food Store as well as cafes and other retailers.

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

## Origins in Lindfield

This initiative for Lindfield to become a Fairtrade Village is not a political campaign. Rather it has emerged from meetings of a group of Christians from All Saints Church in Lindfield who are supporters of Tearfund. This is an international aid agency, whose current campaign is called Ordinary Heroes which aims to encourage everyone to consider how they can make a difference in the world through personal action.

## Benefits to Lindfield

Being a Fairtrade Village will give Lindfield recognition to residents and visitors that it is a community which supports producers in the developing world to make sure they get a fair price for the products they sell.

The Fairtrade mark does not operate at the expense of local producers. The group in Lindfield are also committed to supporting local farmers and food suppliers.

## Examples of other Fairtrade Towns and Villages

(Population figures in brackets)

Burgess Hill (31,000) and East Grinstead (24,000) have been Fairtrade Towns for 10 years and the Chairman of Burgess Hill Fairtrade, Robert Eggleston, has offered to assist us in Lindfield. In fact the CEO of the Fairtrade Foundation is speaking this evening at the Woolpack in Burgess Hill as part of their Fairtrade Festival.

Other Fairtrade towns and villages in the West and East Sussex are Chichester (27,000), Arundel (3,500), Horsham (55,000), Lewes (17,000), Rye (9,000), Seaford (27,000), Uckfield (14,500).

Lindfield (5,500) and including Lindfield Rural (8,000).

## Next Steps

The first step is to form a committee to start the process of applying for Lindfield to be a Fairtrade Village. The group which have been considering issues about climate change and poverty, are committed to taking forward this idea. In the near future we will be seeking volunteers for the committee from the village.

As well as presenting to the Parish Meeting today, we are keen to explain our ideas to Mid-Sussex District Council to seek their support. We will be encouraging them to use Fairtrade products in their offices and at their council meetings. Churches, schools, clubs, cafes, retailers and other organisations in the village will also be involved".

Questions and comments were invited:

A member of the public stated that the village relied on an active High Street and the traders would have to be active participants in this scheme; he asked whether the Co-op and other shops participating in Fair Trade. Mr. Desmond replied that the Co-op as a movement was heavily involved; all the traders had been visited and some were already selling items such as Fair Trade cotton and some local institutions were already involved, e.g. the Evangelical Free Church which ran a Fair Trade stall. Mr. Desmond clarified that the Fair Trade group would not compete with, but would be in collaboration with the village retailers.

# LINDFIELD PARISH MEETING

## 8. OPEN FORUM.

Proposed public toilets on the Common. There was further brief discussion during which Mrs. S. Blunden sought clarification as to whether the 100 people who had signed the petition referred to by Mr. Mackenzie were in fact Lindfield residents. Mr. Mackenzie confirmed that some of them lived in Haywards Heath but 80 were known to be genuine electors.

It was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** *that Lindfield Parish Council should resolve to drop the current plan [for building public toilet facilities on Lindfield Common adjacent to Edge Lea, Backwoods Lane] now to avoid further waste of funds and continued anxiety for a number of residents”.*

The Chairman put the motion to the vote by electors of Lindfield (urban) Parish, noting that resolutions passed at Parish Meetings were not binding on the Parish Council but that such resolutions would be put on the agenda for consideration at the next Council meeting.

14 electors of Lindfield urban Parish voted in favour of the motion, with no votes against. The remainder of electors present abstained.

A complementary proposal was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED**: *that Lindfield Parish Council should arrange for an independent options appraisal to be carried out which takes full account of a health and safety appraisal and full risk assessment in relation to the proposed location to protect the reputation of the Council”*

The Chairman put the motion to the vote by electors of Lindfield (urban) Parish:

14 electors of Lindfield urban Parish voted in favour of the motion, with no votes against. The remainder of electors present abstained

## 9. CHAIRMAN'S CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The Chairman thanked those present for their attendance and for their contributions during the meeting. He expressed appreciation to his fellow Councillors for their support over the past year and thanked the office staff for their guidance, dedication and support.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 9.30 p.m. and invited those present to join him for refreshments.