



Meeting of the Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held in The Council Chamber, County Hall, St Annes Crescent, Lewes on Wednesday, 14 October 2015 at 2.35pm

Present:

Councillor R O'Keeffe (Chair)

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; W Botting; B Bovington; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; S Davy; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; V lent; T Jones; I Linington; A Loraine; R Maskell; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; T Rowell; S Saunders; J Sheppard; A Smith; C Sugarman; R Turner and L Wallraven.

Apologies received:

Councillors R Blackman, J Carr, A Lambert and E Merry.

Minutes

24 Minutes

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 16 July 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

25 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Giles declared his personal, non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 8 (Response to Petition: Meeching Down).

Action

Councillor Adeniji declared his personal, non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 9 (Response to Petition: The Buckle Car Park).

26 Election of the Leader of the Council

The Chair of the Council invited the Solicitor to inform the Council of the nomination which had been received for the Office of Leader of the Council.

The Solicitor reported that Councillor Andy Smith had been nominated to the Office of Leader of the Council.

Councillor Jones moved, and Councillor Botting seconded, the motion:

“That Councillor Andy Smith be elected Leader of the Council for the period until the Annual Council Meeting following the next local elections in May 2019 unless he resigned from Office; was no longer a Councillor; was removed from Office by resolution of the Council; or was otherwise disqualified by law.”

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

26.1 Accordingly.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Smith, then outlined his aspirations for his period of office during which he looked forward to a period of stability at the Council; paid tribute to the commitment of the Council’s Officers; and reported that he looked forward to working with those Councillors who formed the political opposition on the Council.

27 To Receive any Announcements From the Chair of the Council, Leader of the Council, Members of the Cabinet or the Chief Executive

(i) Training Needs Analysis self-assessment form

The Chair of the Council reported that the Council was undertaking an assessment of development needs for individual Councillors and that they should have received a Training Needs Analysis self-assessment form to complete. The information gathered would help the Council to organise training and development activities to meet Councillor’s individual requirements; and to put together a training programme for all Councillors, following on from their induction training.

Councillors were reminded to complete their form and to return it in the post to Caroline Hanlon, Civic and Member Services Officer, by Monday, 9 November 2015. Alternatively, the forms could be handed in at the Extraordinary Meeting of the Council on 9 November 2015 which was referred to under Agenda Item No 18 at the Meeting.

CMT

(ii) Chair of the Council's Engagements

The Council received the list of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Council's engagements carried out since the Meeting of the Council held on 16 July 2015.

28 Petitions

- (a) The Chair received a petition from Councillor Carter and Ms Chelsea Renton which contained a total of 2676 signatures, 1687 of which were from people who were from the District. The signatories to the petition were "deeply concerned" about the proposed development plans for the Phoenix/North Street Estate, Lewes, which involved the Council and Santon and called upon the Council to rethink those plans in order to better meet the needs of that town.

Councillor Carter and Ms Renton addressed the Council on the subject matter of the petition and the number of signatures.

As the petition contained 1,500 or more signatures, in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme, as set out in Part 6 of its Constitution, it would be debated by the Council at a future meeting as an individual Agenda Item.

DBSD

- (b) The Chair received a petition from Councillor Murray which contained 2300 signatures. It called upon the Council to halt the scheme to build on a number of community asset sites, and to look again at how to assist in the building of social and affordable housing in the District in order to achieve such aim without depriving the community of "many irreplaceable facilities". The petition further called upon the Council to include local residents and Ward councillors from across the District from the start in any and every new proposal.

Councillor Murray addressed the Council on the subject matter of the petition and the number of signatures.

As the petition contained 1,500 or more signatures, in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme, as set out in Part 6 of its Constitution, it would be debated by the Council at a future meeting as an individual Agenda Item.

DSD

- (c) The Chair received part of an on-going petition from Mr Vivian Carrick, which contained approximately 1400. It called upon the Council to halt the scheme to build on a number of community asset sites, and to look again at how to assist in the building of social and affordable housing in the District in order to achieve such aim without depriving the community of "many irreplaceable facilities", particularly the Steyning Avenue car park in Peacehaven.

Mr Carrick addressed the Council on the subject matter of the petition and the number of signatures.

(NB Subsequent to the Meeting, Mr Carrick indicated that in excess of a further 100 signatures would be submitted to the Council in respect of the petition. Consequently, as the petition would then contain 1,500 or more signatures, in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme, as set out in Part 6 of its Constitution, it would be debated by the Council at a future meeting as an individual Agenda Item).

DSD

29 Response to Petition: Meeching Down

At its Meeting on 16 July 2015, the Council had received a petition from Councillors Saunders and Carr which contained 1562 signatures. It had stated:

“Meeching Down, known locally as The Union, is a woodland area widely used by local people of all ages for recreation, walking and relaxation. It is one of only a handful of green spaces in the area, is abundant with wildlife and provides an area of natural tranquillity in an otherwise urbanised area.

Whilst we recognise that there is a need for new and affordable homes in the town, we feel strongly that Meeching Down is not an appropriate site for development.”

Also submitted with the petition were two pages of comments from people who had signed the petition, many of the comments related to concerns about the loss of a natural habitat and green space, and others related to the number of brownfield sites available for development in Newhaven, together with concerns about the extra infrastructure needed to support the additional housing.

In light of the number of signatures and in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme, the petition would be debated by the Council as an individual Agenda Item at this meeting.

The Solicitor reported that, whilst Members of the Planning Applications Committee were properly able to participate in the debate in respect of the Report, in doing so, they needed to ensure that they made no comment which would effectively bar them from later consideration of any planning application submitted. The Solicitor gave examples of the sort of comment which might indicate that a Member had pre-determined any planning application.

Councillor Catlin moved, and Councillor Adeniji seconded, the motion that the information which was set out in that part of Report No 134/15 in respect of the petition and which contained Exempt (ie confidential) information, could be included in the public debate in respect thereof.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

29.1 Accordingly.

Councillor Osborne moved, and Councillor Saunders seconded, the motion that:

- (i) It be noted that the site known as Meeching Down in Newhaven has been identified by the ruling administration as a potential site to provide 100% affordable, council owned housing as part of the New Homes Project (also known as the 49 Sites);
- (ii) The Council undertakes further studies as identified within the ecology report to fully understand the potential for the site to support a range of wildlife and how any impact by development could be mitigated; and
- (iii) The Council commits to offer the remainder of the site, if or when it is built on, for devolution to Newhaven Town Council, charging the site with a restrictive covenant and/or overage clause, to ensure the rest of the site is preserved as open space indefinitely.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and the vote thereon was recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.5 as follows:

For the Motion:

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; W Botting; B Bovington; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; A Loraine; R Maskell; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; S Saunders; A Smith and C Sugarman (24).

Against the Motion:

Councillors S Murray and T Rowell (2).

Abstained:

Councillors J Carter; S Davy; P Gardiner; V lent; T Jones; I Linington; D Neave; T Nicholson; J Sheppard; R Turner and L Wallraven (11).

and it was

Resolved:

29.2 Accordingly.

(Note: Councillor Giles declared his personal, non-prejudicial interest in this item as his garden backed on to the land, therefore, he took part in the consideration, discussion and voting thereon).

DSD

30 Response to Petition: The Buckle Car Park

At its Meeting on 16 July 2015, the Council had received a petition from Councillor Wallraven and Sylvia Dunn which contained 2054 signatures. It had stated:

“We the undersigned, residents of Seaford, East Sussex, and other regular users of the Buckle Car Park, object to the plans to sell off in order to build for development, the Buckle Car Park.

We call upon all levels of government involved in planning and building developers:

To reject this proposed plan

For Seaford Town Council to recognise Buckle Car Park as a community asset and register it as such with Lewes District in support of local residents views on the importance of retaining amenities in this area

For Lewes District to take note of the residents views and to not sell off this land for further development of the seafront.”

In light of the number of signatures and in accordance with the Council’s Petitions Scheme, the petition would be debated by the Council as an individual Agenda Item at this meeting.

The Council’s attention was drawn to an error that was contained within paragraph 2.20(b) of Report No 135/15 relating to the petition which included the text “The Buckle is included in the list of sites within Phase 1b.” However, it was reported that The Buckle was a Phase 1a site.

The Solicitor reported that, whilst Members of the Planning Applications Committee were properly able to participate in the debate in respect of the Report, in doing so, they needed to ensure that they made no comment which would effectively bar them from later consideration of any planning application submitted. The Solicitor gave examples of the sort of comment which might indicate that a Member had pre-determined any planning application.

Councillor Adeniji moved, and Councillor Peterson seconded, the motion that the information which was set out in that part of Report No 135/15 and which contained Exempt (ie confidential) information, could be included in the public debate in respect thereof.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

30.1 Accordingly.

The meeting was adjourned for approximately five minutes at this point in order that Councillors could informally discuss the text of a series of proposed motions in respect of the Report.

Councillor Adeniji, in consultation with Councillor Osborne, moved, and Councillor Nicholson seconded, four motions which were put to the meeting, Declared Carried, the votes thereon were recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.5 as follows:

Motion 1:

That it be noted that the site known as The Buckle, comprising of a car park, HGV park, public toilets, mini-recycling centre and a leased area, has been identified by the ruling administration to provide housing as part of the New Homes Project (also known as the 49 Sites).

For the Motion:

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; W Botting; B Bovington; S Catlin; M Chartier; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; I Linington; A Loraine; R Maskell; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; S Saunders; A Smith and C Sugarman (27).

Against the Motion:

Councillors J Carter; S Murray and T Rowell (3).

Abstained:

Councillors D Cooper; S Davy; V lent; T Jones; J Sheppard; R Turner and L Wallraven (7).

Motion 2:

That, if or when a Planning Application is approved, mini recycling points will be provided in the wider context of the agreed waste strategy.

For the Motion:

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; W Botting; B Bovington; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; V lent; A Loraine; R Maskell; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; T Rowell; S Saunders; A Smith and C Sugarman (31).

Abstained:

Councillors S Davy; T Jones; I Linington; J Sheppard; R Turner and L Wallraven (6).

Motion 3:

That prior to the implementation of any Planning Permission, the Officers

will work with Seaford Town Council and groups such as the Seaford Seniors Forum to first provide alternative toilets within the area.

For the Motion:

Councillors S Adeniji; G Amy; S Barnes; W Botting; B Bovington; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; S Gauntlett; B Giles; O Honeyman; A Loraine; R Maskell; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; T Rowell; S Saunders; A Smith and C Sugarman (28).

Abstained:

Councillors S Davy; P Gardiner; J Harrison-Hicks; V Ient; T Jones; I Linington; J Sheppard; R Turner and L Wallraven (9).

Motion 4:

That prior to the implementation of any Planning Permission at The Buckle the Officers first provide alternative car parking.

For the Motion:

Councillors S Adeniji; S Barnes; W Botting; B Bovington; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; S Gauntlett; B Giles; O Honeyman; A Loraine; R Maskell; D Neave; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; S Saunders; A Smith and C Sugarman (24).

Abstained:

Councillors G Amy; S Davy; P Gardiner; J Harrison-Hicks; V Ient; T Jones; I Linington; S Murray; T Nicholson; T Rowell; J Sheppard; R Turner and L Wallraven (13).

Councillor Adeniji moved, and Councillor Nicholson seconded, a further motion which was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, the votes thereon were recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.5 as follows:

Motion 5:

That Officers find adequate and alternative car parking and toilet provision and that prior to the submission of any planning application in respect of The Buckle site that they report back to Council at the earliest opportunity with details of such alternative provision.

For the Motion:

Councillors S Adeniji; S Barnes; W Botting; B Bovington; J Carter; S Catlin; M Chartier; D Cooper; N Enever; P Franklin; P Gander; P Gardiner; S Gauntlett; B Giles; J Harrison-Hicks; O Honeyman; A Loraine; R Maskell; S Murray; D Neave; T Nicholson; R O’Keeffe; S Osborne; J Peterson; R Robertson; S Saunders; A Smith; C Sugarman (28).

Abstained:

Councillors G Amy; S Davy; V lent; T Jones; I Linington; T Rowell; J Sheppard; R Turner and L Wallraven (9).

and it was

Resolved:

30.2 Accordingly.

(Note: Councillor Adeniji declared his personal, non-prejudicial interest in this item as he lived approximately 100 metres from The Buckle car park, therefore, he took part in the consideration, discussion and voting thereon).

DSD

31 Questions to the Leader of the CouncilQuestionerQuestion/Response

Councillor
Murray

Question:

Over 1000 people had signed a petition which stated that refugees were welcome in Lewes and that a march in solidarity with refugees would take place in Lewes on 31 October. Numerous fundraising efforts were under way to support refugees in Calais and elsewhere. A number of residents had contacted Councillor Murray to ask about any co-ordination that would enable them to offer a room or other support to refugees who arrived in Lewes and Councillor Murray wanted to be in a position to support the refugees effectively.

At a meeting with the previous Leader of the Council in respect of the refugee crisis, Councillor Murray was promised that she would be kept informed of any meetings or other conversations between the Council and East Sussex County Council in respect thereof in order that she could pass on useful information to concerned residents. However, to date, Councillor Murray had not heard anymore. Therefore, she requested the new Leader of the Council to report the steps being taken to support any refugees that were coming to Lewes, that he confirm that his predecessor's promise remained in place and that she be copied in to any discussions that related to the issue.

Response (by Councillor Smith, Leader of the Council):

The Council had been in discussion with East Sussex County Council. The Council was waiting to be advised by the Government on the number of refugees that needed to be accommodated in the District. Councillor Murray would be informed of the progress on such issues.

DSD

<u>Questioner</u>	<u>Question/Response</u>
Councillor Harrison-Hicks	<p><u>Question:</u> Councillor Harrison-Hicks reported that the Steyning Avenue car park in Peacehaven was extremely well used by those who attended local businesses and many retailers in that area, most of which were located along the already congested A259 road where parking was not allowed. A sample survey which had been undertaken of the usage to which the car park was put was not enough to accurately reflect its regular useage. Councillor Harrison-Hicks felt that, if that car park was to be removed and the land used for development there would be a negative impact on local livelihoods and businesses which was not acceptable. Peacehaven wanted to attract businesses not loose those which it currently had.</p> <p>The aerial photograph of the car park which was on the Council's website illustrated only a small number of cars parked in the facility. That image was out of date and misleading.</p> <p>Had the Council undertaken any work in order to understand the level of impact on local businesses before the land was included in its redevelopment plans?</p> <p><u>Response (by Councillor Smith, Leader of the Council):</u> Councillor Smith reported that he been around and spoken to local businesses in respect to such matter. He was concerned that it appeared that the Council had not previously undertaken any work in order to understand the potential impact on local businesses and jobs before the land was included in its redevelopment plans. The car park was located in the economic area of Peacehaven and he agreed that local businesses might be affected if the car park facility was removed.</p> <p>Councillor Smith had spoken with the Officers who were considering the issue and the availability of alternative car parking facilities in that location.</p>
Councillor Davy	<p><u>Question:</u> At the Council Meeting held on 16 July 2015, Councillor Davy had asked the previous Leader of the Council to establish a Councillor-led working group in order to investigate the possibility to adopting a modern, streamlined Committee or hybrid system to replace the current Cabinet system of governance. That Leader had agreed that the issue needed investigation and that further information needed to be obtained in order that options could be examined.</p>

<u>Questioner</u>	<u>Question/Response</u>	
	<p>Councillor Davy requested the new Leader of the Council to give his assurance that such agreement be honoured and be given high priority in order that Councillors could participate more in the democratic process.</p> <p><u>Response (by Councillor Smith, Leader of the Council):</u> Councillor Smith responded by indicating that a written reply would be sent to Councillor Davy in respect of her question.</p>	ADCS (Head of Dem Svcce)
Councillor Osborne	<p><u>Question:</u> At the Council Meeting that was held on 16 July 2015, Councillor Osborne had asked the previous Leader of the Council why he had defended his refusal to pay a living wage to the Council's staff by indicating that some of them had special needs.</p> <p>Whilst he had not answered that question he had, nevertheless, undertaken to provide Councillor Osborne with a written reply for which she was still waiting. Consequently, Councillor Osborne requested that such reply be sent to her within the next two weeks by the previous Leader of the Council.</p> <p><u>Response (by Councillor Smith, Leader of the Council):</u> Councillor Smith could not speak on behalf of the previous Leader of the Council who was not in attendance at this Meeting neither could he compel him to send such reply to Councillor Osborne. However, Councillor Smith undertook to mention Councillor Osborne's issue to the previous Leader of the Council in the event that he met up with him.</p>	DBSD
Councillor Saunders	<p><u>Question:</u> Councillor Saunders reported that, at a recent presentation, Councillors had been advised that, despite the appropriate government requirement to do so having been withdrawn in 2008, the current administration had commissioned a residents' survey at a cost of £10,000 together with some Office's time. Councillors had also been advised that a proportion of the questions that had been asked were based around the current administration's own forward plan and the pledges that were set out in the Conservative' manifesto at the last election.</p> <p>Councillor Saunders asked the Leader of the Council to confirm that, in the current time of austerity, the Council spent such money on a survey that was not required and which was based, in part, on questions that were on a</p>	

<u>Questioner</u>	<u>Question/Response</u>
	<p>political agenda which had resulted in only a tiny proportion of around 1% of responses from residents.</p> <p><u>Response (by Councillor Smith, Leader of the Council):</u> Councillor Smith indicated that the survey had been undertaken using funding that was contained within the Council's budget for such purpose and a similar exercise had not been done since 2008. Councillor Smith explained that if anyone was delivering services, which the Council did, then it was best practice to undertake that kind of customer sampling. The survey had been relatively representative of the population across the Council's wards and the Council was listening to what residents had said. It was equally important to understand what the Council was doing well as it was to identify any improvements which might be necessary.</p>

32 Ward Issues

Ward issues were raised by Councillors on the following subjects:

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
Councillor Davy – Chailey and Wivelsfield Ward	<p>Councillor Davy reported that the Bluebell Railway's application to the Heritage Lottery Fund in support of its Accessible Steam Heritage Project, had passed the first round for agreed support in the sum of £30,000. The Project would revitalise the way that the Railway displayed its locomotives by way of substantial repairs to the Running Shed which would be converted into an exhibition hall.</p> <p>Councillor Davy thanked the Chair and the Council for their support of the Railway.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council be requested to continue its support of the Bluebell Railway.</p>	DBSD
Councillor Osborne – Plumpton, Streat, East Chiltington and St John Without Ward	<p>East Chiltington Parish Council had repeatedly written to the Council with Freedom of Information requests in respect of the Council's strategy regarding the '49 Sites' (ie the New Homes Project), with particular regard to the potential building of homes on land at Hollycroft. No replies had yet been received and they were currently outside the timescale for such responses.</p>	

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
	<p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Officers be requested to reply immediately to East Chiltington Parish Council's Freedom of Information requests.</p>	ADCS
Councillor Enever – Peacehaven East Ward	<p>The Steyning Avenue car park in Peacehaven was included for development in the Council's New Homes Project. The parking assessment that had been prepared for the Council had indicated that, in the event of the car park being closed, there would be insufficient on-street spaces available. The car park also offered an informal park-and-ride facility which supported wider sustainable travel initiatives. The proposed development of the site, and that of the Piddinghoe Avenue car park in Peacehaven, would also involve the loss of recycling facilities.</p> <p>Councillor Enever felt that the closure of the car park facility would result in the loss of local businesses and employment.</p> <p>The Council had indicated that, in the event that the car park was to close, it would look to provide alternative car parking facilities. East Sussex County Council was also looking to improve bus and cycling travel along the A259 road which might also result in the loss of further parking places.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> In light of the impact on the local economy and the environment, that the proposal to develop Steyning Avenue car park be reconsidered at a future meeting of the Cabinet.</p>	DSD
Councillor Saunders – Newhaven Valley Ward	<p>In some previous years, Councillors Saunders and Robertson had successfully requested the provision of free parking concessions in Newhaven on the approach to Christmas.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That consideration be given to again supporting such concession and that parking charges be waived in the town of Newhaven for the two weeks prior to Christmas 2015 in order to support the businesses therein.</p>	DBSD

33 Recommendations from Cabinet**Reserved Item**

The Leader of the Council moved, and Councillor Davy seconded, the motion that the recommendations of Cabinet held on 24 September 2015 contained in Minute 23 relating to Adoption of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Charging Schedule, be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

33.1 Accordingly.

DBSD

34 Notices of Motion

(a) The Chair reported that a Notice of Motion had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 13 by Councillor Gauntlett which related to a proposal that the Council works with Community Transport Lewes Area (CTLA) to convene a working party of representatives from all Town and Parish Councils to discuss common issues of providing community led transportation support for their residents.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13, Councillor Gauntlett moved, and Councillor Robertson seconded, the Notice of Motion as follows:

“That Lewes District Council works with Community Transport Lewes Area (CTLA), to convene a working party of representatives from all Town and Parish Councils to discuss common issues of providing community led transportation support for their residents.

CTLA are aware of the constraints on LDC finances and are not seeking funding from LDC to arrange this meeting.

Background

East Sussex County Council have implemented substantial reductions in the amount spent on subsidised bus services across the county. This may leave vulnerable people isolated and present difficulties for them to access care provided by health and social services.

CTLA is pro-actively considering ways of providing alternative services. As a charity they are determined to examine ways of providing support for members of the Lewes District community and in the process addressing social isolation and contributing to improving health and wellbeing.

The involvement of LDC in organising this meeting would give considerable weight to the importance of this issue and demonstrate that LDC is proactively considering the impact of the ESCC funding changes for its residents”.

With the consent of the Council and with the agreement of his seconder, Councillor Gauntlett agreed to the amendment of his Notice of Motion to indicate that he (ie Councillor Gauntlett) be appointed to represent the Council on the Working Party referred to above.

The amended motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

34.1 Accordingly.

(b) The Chair reported that a Notice of Motion had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 13 by Councillor Cooper which related to the composition of the South Down National Park Authority's Planning Committee and the venue for it's meetings.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13 and with the agreement of the Council, Councillor Cooper moved, and Councillor Ient seconded, a revised version of the Notice of Motion to that which was set out under Agenda Item No 15(b) in the Council's papers as follows *(NB the revision related to the deletion of the words "We call on the SDNP to urgently:" and to their replacement with the words "The Council agrees to write to the SDNP, asking it to urgently:")*:

"The South Downs National Park is unique in having the largest market towns of any UK national park - Lewes, Petersfield and Midhurst - yet none of the District Councillors for Lewes Town sit on the SDNP's Planning Committee, and residents are effectively barred from making oral representations to the SDNP Planning Committee by virtue of the distance, time, inconvenience and cost required to travel to Midhurst. This situation is widely considered by Town residents and their elected representatives to be completely unacceptable constituting as it does a significant deficit in local democracy.

At a time when the Town is facing the prospect of unprecedented large-scale and potentially character changing development it is vital that the voices of Lewes Town residents and their elected representatives are more directly heard.

The Council agrees to write to the SDNP, asking it to urgently:

1. Return to holding planning meetings in Petersfield, Midhurst and Lewes, dealing with the appropriate applications at each venue. This may mean more meetings, but will help to reduce the democratic deficit engendered by holding all meetings in Midhurst.

2. Allow more opportunity for Town Councillors to speak than the single councillor currently permitted. Town Councils represent many times the average parish council.

Given the speed at which some developments are proceeding, we request that, on both matters, SDNP consider proposing both:

1. Urgent interim measures to improve representation and voice for each town, such as via video-conferencing facilities (which in Lewes, could be based at the Town, District or County Hall)
2. Longer-term solutions to improve the situation, to be put out for consultation with residents.”

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

34.2 Accordingly.

DSD

35 Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2015/16

The Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Gardiner, moved, and Councillor Gander seconded, the motion that the recommendation contained in Report No 136/15 relating to the Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2015/16, be received and adopted, and that the Council's thanks and best wishes be extended to the Performance Officer (Scrutiny), Rachel Allan, who had provided good service to meetings of that Committee for several years and who was leaving her employment with the Council on 25 October 2015.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

35.1 Accordingly.

DBSD

36 Remit of the Licensing Committee

The Leader of the Council moved, and Councillor Botting seconded, the motion that, subject to the Assistant Director of Corporate Services being authorised to make minor alterations to the text of the recommendation, as set out at Agenda Item No 17 relating to the Remit of the Licensing Committee, so as to clarify the intention thereof, the recommendation be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

36.1 Accordingly.

ADCS/
Head of
Dem
Svces

The Assistant Director of Corporate Services drew the Council's attention to a further proposed amendment to the Council's Constitution which related to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers in respect of the Environmental Health Functions of the Director of Service Delivery which, if approved, would add a provision in respect of Licensing that would reflect an existing provision that the Director had in respect of Planning.

Councillor Osborne moved, and Councillor Gander seconded, the motion that the amendment be received and adopted.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

36.2 That the Assistant Director of Corporate Services be authorised to add the following text to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers in respect of the Environmental Health Functions of the Director of Service Delivery:

“(q) Provided that the Director shall have the discretion to decide that an application or other licensing matter which he/she considers to be contentious or controversial shall be referred to the Licensing Committee for determination”.

ADCS/
DSD/
Head of
Dem
Svces

37 Electoral Review

The Chair of the Council moved, and Councillor Bovington seconded, the motion that the Council note that an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council would be held in the Council Chamber, County Hall, St Annes Crescent, Lewes, on Monday, 9 November 2015 commencing at 2.30pm, at which matters relating to the next stage of the Electoral Review process would be considered.

The motion was put to the meeting, Declared Carried, and it was

Resolved:

37.1 Accordingly.

ADCS/
Head of
Dem
Svces

38 Reporting Back on Meetings of Outside Bodies

(a) 3VA – Councillor Peterson

Councillor Peterson reported that he had attended two meetings of the 3VA Board (Voluntary Action Lewes) upon which he had been appointed to serve as the Council's representative.

He reported that the Council provided 3VA with an annual grant in the sum of £28,000. It had an enabling role and, working with over 200

organisations, it represented the voluntary services that were available in Lewes and Wealden Districts and in Eastbourne Borough. It also offered a monthly drop-in session at the Council's offices in Southover House, Lewes.

There was to be a meeting between the Council and 3VA in January 2016 at which the Council would consider ways in which 3VA's services could be improved. 3VA wanted to learn about the Council's priorities and what it wanted to develop. 3VA also wanted the Council to be aware of and utilise the help that it offered.

Councillor Peterson encouraged Councillors to send groups from within their respective Wards to 3VA in order that they could benefit from training and organisational help. Additionally, it was changing its Information Technology system so as to make it more flexible and accessible to groups that wished to develop a 'hub and spoke' connectivity for their communities.

Resolved:

- 38.1** That the oral Report of Councillor Peterson relating to meetings of the 3VA Board (Voluntary Action Lewes) which he had attended as the Council's representative, be received and noted.

(b) Wave Leisure – Councillor O’Keeffe

Councillor O’Keeffe reported that she had attended some meetings of Wave Leisure to which she had been appointed to serve as the Council's representative.

Wave Leisure continued to be a very hard-working and positive organisation which was operating very well.

Resolved:

- 38.2** That the oral Report of Councillor O’Keeffe relating to meetings of Wave Leisure which she had attended as the Council's representative, be received and noted.

(c) People and Places Policy Board of the Local Government Association – Councillor Osborne

Councillor Osborne reported that, for the next couple of years at least, she was a representative on the People and Places Policy Board of the Local Government Association (LGA) which particularly represented the role of non-metropolitan authorities and covered issues such as devolution, skills, economic growth, housing and transport. Such Boards engaged with Councils and developed Council priorities, shaped the LGA business plan and oversaw the strategic priorities of the LGA Executive.

As the LGA was a cross-party organisation, Councillor Osborne encouraged all Councillors to contact her with details of any areas upon which they had concerns or if they had any innovative ideas that they wished to be raised at

national level. The Board was next meeting on Monday, 19 October 2015 at which it would be considering its work programme for the year.

Resolved:

- 38.3** That the oral Report of Councillor Osborne relating to the People and Places Policy Board of the Local Government Association, be received and noted.

The meeting ended at 6.08pm.

R O'Keeffe
Chair