



Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council
Email: office@hurstpierpoint-pc.gov.uk
Website: www.hurstpierpoint-pc.gov.uk
Telephone: 01273 833264

Village Centre
Trinity Road
Hurstpierpoint
West Sussex BN6 9UY

Minutes of the Council Meeting held on Thursday 25 June 2026 at 7.30 pm at Hurstpierpoint Village Centre.

Members Present:

Cllr Malcolm Llewellyn (Chairman)	Cllr Rodney Jackson (WSCC/MSDC)
Cllr Sarah Baldey	Cllr Annette Street
Cllr Susan Dyke	Cllr Lindsay Thompson
Cllr Shaun Hole	

Also Present: Sarah Groom, Clerk to the Council and Cllr Lyn Williams and Cllr Zeidler (MSDC).

Not Present: Cllr Michael Avery.

C26/27.041: Apologies for Absence: Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Helen Bedford, Cllr Claire Majasai, Cllr Duncan Ranger, Cllr Bob Sampson and Cllr Julia Shorrocks and it was:

RESOLVED: That the Council ACCEPTS the apologies for absence for Cllrs Bedford, Majasai, Ranger, Sampson and Shorrocks.

C26/27.042: Declarations of interest: Cllr Hole declared an interest in item C26/27.043 - Draft Mid Sussex District Plan as a land owner in Sayers Common. Cllr Baldey declared an interest in item C26/27.043 - Draft Mid Sussex District Plan as a property owner adjacent to sites proposed in the draft Plan. Cllr Dyke declared an interest in item C26/27.044:3(ii) - Court Bushes Decorating Quotes, as the proposed contractor was known to her.

C26/27.043: Previous Minutes: Members received the minutes of the annual meeting of the Council held on 21 May 2026, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the Council ADOPTS the minutes of 21 May 2026.

C26/27.044: Committee Minutes: Members received and as appropriate, considered the recommendations of the:

C26/27.044.1: Planning Committee (1 June 2026): There were no recommendations for Council.

C26/27.044.2: Community Engagement Committee (11 June 2026): There were no recommendations for Council.

C26/27.044.3: Finance, Governance & Estates Committee (18 June 2026): There were two recommendations for Council:

- i) **F26/27.010: Cleaning Contract:** The Committee considered a briefing note setting out a timetable and specification for options for the future cleaning of Court Bushes Community Hub, the Village Centre and the public conveniences. The Committee was more minded to utilise a contractor for the cleaning services rather than an employee but would review both options when the quotations were received, and it was: **RESOLVED: That the Committee AGREED to recommend the specification and timetable to Council for the future cleaning of Court Bushes Community Hub, the Village Centre and the public conveniences, and it was:**

RESOLVED: That Council AGREES the specification and timetable for the future cleaning of Court Bushes Community Hub, the Village Centre and the public conveniences.

- ii) **F26/27.011: Court Bushes Decorating Quotes:** The Committee considered a briefing note setting out quotes for the redecoration of the whole of the interior of Court Bushes Community Hub, and it was: **RESOLVED: That the Committee AGREED to recommend to Council the appointment of J.D Ritchie Painting and Decorating to decorate Court Bushes Community Hub for a total cost of £10,420 plus VAT, with funds from the Court Bushes Sinking Fund Earmarked Reserve, and it was:**

RESOLVED: That Council AGREES the appointment of J.D Ritchie Painting and Decorating to decorate Court Bushes Community Hub for a total cost of £10,420 plus VAT using funds from the Court Bushes Sinking Fund Earmarked Reserve.

RESOLVED: That the Council RECEIVES the minutes of the following Committees, and AGREES the above recommendations:

- i. Planning Committee (1 June 2026)
- ii. Community Engagement Committee (11 June 2026)
- iii. Finance, Governance & Estates Committee (18 June 2026).

C26/27.044: Councillor Co-option: Members noted the withdrawal of the one application received, to co-opt councillors to fill the two remaining ordinary vacancies, and would consider a revised timetable for re-advertising the vacancies at the next Council meeting. There is no requirement to advertise councillor vacancies within six months prior to the next Parish Council elections on 6 May 2027 (i.e. after 6 November 2026).

C26/27.045: Adjournment for Questions from the Public: The meeting was adjourned to cover the next four agenda items. There was one member of the public present who wished to know the Parish Council's position on the College Lane, Thakeham Homes site. The Chairman explained that further discussion during the meeting would cover this matter.

C26/27.046: Reports from Other Authorities: Members received reports from representatives of other authorities:

C26/27.046.1: Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC): Cllr Zeidler had provided a brief written report and explained the main issues were the draft District Plan. Cllr Zeidler reported that he had also attended a Scrutiny Committee meeting with Cllr Williams, which included the MSDC Parking Strategy and village parking charges proposal, although facts were presented to them, there was nothing that could be actively scrutinised. Cllr Jackson had provided a brief written report regarding the draft District Plan.

C26/27.046.2: West Sussex County Council: Cllr Jackson had provided a written report outlining the new composition of the County Council and the visit he had with the Highways Team at Job's Lane. He had also confirmed his support of the proposed 20mph zone extension in Hurstpierpoint, following consultation with the Chairman.

The Chairman thanked Cllr Jackson, Cllr Williams and Cllr Zeidler for their reports.

C26/27.047: Draft Mid Sussex District Plan: Members received a verbal update on the latest position with the draft Mid Sussex District Plan including updates from the Mid Sussex District Ward Councillors. Cllr Williams had kindly provided a written summary of the current position that had been circulated earlier. Cllr Zeidler explained that the new, additional sites was partly due to MSDC discarding more sites than the Planning Inspector envisaged given the criteria applied. Cllr Zeidler was also concerned that the MSDC Members will have the opportunity built into the timetable, to consider these new additional sites before the MSDC Officers proceed to adding them to the draft Plan.

The Chairman was still waiting for a clear definition as to how the in-combination testing would be applied. It had been explained to him that new additional sites were considered in conjunction with the other new additional sites and the existing proposed sites in the draft Plan, but there was a lack of clarity as to how they would be tested against existing settlements and the wider area, which is arguably more important. The Chairman had also identified contradictions in the sheets prepared for each new, additional site (for example the three sites on College Lane). Cllr Zeidler felt that MSDC Officers would not know each site individually as well as the Parish Councillors, and therefore relied partly on the Parish Council doing their fact checking for them. It was agreed that the Parish Council will maintain the focus upon MSDC to ensure the best possible outcome for the residents of the parish and would reply in full to the next round of consultation, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the Council AGREES to maintain the focus upon MSDC to ensure the best possible outcome for the residents of the parish and would reply in full to the next round of consultation.

C26/27.048: Section 106 Requirements: Members considered a briefing note setting out the request from MSDC to comment on the new/additional site policies, plus the Parish Council's requirements for assets to be included in the

Section 106 legal agreements, per site, for large planning applications by 26 June 2026. MSDC had also asked for a list of generic requests to submit to the Section 106 Team for current planning applications by 1 September 2026.

The Chairman explained that although the Parish Council has been asked to re-state its priorities for financial contributions from the developers, what was really required were land parcels for sites for allotments, countryside open spaces and burial grounds etc. Other ideas put forward were land for car parks, requirements for homes to be built without the use of fossil fuels or toilets flushed with drinking water, youth provision, and public toilet provision. The Chairman explained that developers will build to the standards required by the National Planning Policy Framework. As alternative energy sources and rainwater harvesting weren't included in the NPPF, developers do not have to include them. MSDC Planners are consulting bus and rail companies. It was thought that post COVID there is capacity on the trains but there is no capacity in the station car parks. It was also noted that multi-faith places of worship still needed to be included, possibly making use of the community buildings. These suggestions will be included in the feedback required to be sent to MSDC by 26 June 2026, 5pm.

MSDC has advised the Parish Council that the optimum opportunity to request Section 106 funds is when the Planning Applications are being considered by the Planning Committee. In October 2023, the Parish Council provided MSDC with a list of its requirement for Section 106 funds. Any supplementary infrastructure requirements, specific to a particular site, can also be added by the Planning Committee. A checklist of options will be devised that can be used by the Planning Committee to add to the comments fed back to MSDC on each individual application. The threshold for Section 106 to apply will also be confirmed. Comments made can be both generic contributions to local needs or specific requirements that are relevant to the site in question, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the Council AGREES to submit its comments on the draft Site Policies for the new additional sites by 26 June 2026, and to submit the projects to place on the Section 106 list of requests to the Section 106 Team by 1 September 2026.

C26/27.049: Asset Transfers: Members considered a briefing note that outlines the assets owned by the Parish, District and County Councils in the Parish, and considered who might own and manage them in future, in the context of the reorganisation of local government and the creation of a new unitary authority. It was noted that although some local district and borough councils were having positive discussions with their town and parish councils such as Horsham District Council, MSDC will not allow any discussions to take place, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the Council AGREES to:

- i. **Investigate freehold ownership of the land leased to the Parish Council by WSCC at the Millennium Garden and St George's Green, and request freehold transfers of the land the Village Centre sits on, and the land off Brown Twins Road attached to Hurst Meadows;**
- ii. **Investigate freehold ownership of the MSDC owned car parks, recreation grounds and play areas in the Parish including the land leased to the Hurstpierpoint Scouts;**
- iii. **Seek to divest the Parish Council of all streetlights to the new unitary authority;**
- iv. **Express an interest in operating the western Brookleigh Community Centre by 2 July 2026.**

C26/27.050: Village Centre VAT Reclaim: Members considered how (in principle) to spend the funds received from the HMRC for the Village Centre charity VAT reclaims for 2022/23, 2023/24, 2024/25 (totalling £12,928) and for 2025/26 once claimed, in order that a proposal can be worked up. Suggestions included funding a youth worker salary, or helping the charity pay for the management re-charge fee. Rather than using the funds for running costs, Members agreed at this time, to spend the funds on property improvement projects for the Village Centre, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the Council AGREES in principle to spend the reclaimed VAT to date on property maintenance projects for the Village Centre for example: new boilers, new radiators or new velux windows, subject to quotes being presented to Council in the future.

C26/27.051: Residents Request: Members considered a proposal from a trader for part of South Avenue Recreation Ground to be used for up to twenty parking spaces off South Lane. Members considered the need for additional parking spaces in the village and noted that this is an issue often raised but there was no appetite to use the Recreation Ground for car parking. Whilst Members were sympathetic to the request there was also currently no way of enforcing the suggested use.

The Chairman outlined the legal restrictions on the use of the “Town Field”, now known as South Avenue Recreation Ground, which is a registered village green and therefore protected under the 1906 Open Spaces Act and other Acts applicable to such protected spaces. It was bought by the Parish Council from the Campion family in 1944 from funds provided by a Mrs Talbot. The conveyance from this purchase restricted the use of the land to that of a Recreation Ground. Any changes to these designations would require the permission of the Secretary of State, and alternative green space would have to be provided in the immediate area. It was also felt that South Lane, a private road with public access, was not wide enough to cope with property owners turning into their properties, and other drivers turning to park in the proposed bays. It would have to be investigated whether property owners had rights in their deeds to turn both left and right over South Lane, which meant all their deeds would need amending for a one-way system. A traffic regulation order would be required to enforce any driving or parking restrictions and may not be supported by the users of the Recreation Ground. Parking on the old bowls green and around Pitt Lane toilets had similarly been explored and ruled out.

A further issue is that planning applications are granted by MSDC without sufficient parking provision. MSDC has also been asked whether it has considered the displacement of vehicles from the village car parks onto local roads once charges are introduced. Other sites considered in the past but ruled out for being too sensitive included the land south of the Church. The Chairman concluded by summarising that such proposals had been looked at before and rejected as recently as April 2025 when it was raised by the local MP. Cllr Dyke suggested approaching Washbrooks Farm to see if they would consider use of their overflow car park, perhaps by organisations with permits e.g. St Lawrence School and the Health Centre or other employers at times when it is not needed by them, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the Council AGREES to thank the trader for the proposal and that the Parish Council would approach Washbrooks to investigate organised use of their over-flow car park at their off-peak times.

C26/27.052: Reports from Representatives on Outside Bodies: Members received reports from representative on outside bodies as follows:

C26/27.052.1: Town Twinning Association: Cllr Hole had attended the Town Twinning Association AGM and the Association had thanked the Parish Council for the £400 grant towards equipment for the Summer Fair event which was a great success.

C26/27.052.2: Sayers Common Village Society: Cllr Thompson reported that the Society continues to discuss the draft District Plan.

C26/27.052.3: Hurstpierpoint Society: Cllr Dyke re-stated the Society’s AGM was on 27 June in the Club Suite she was unable to attend so would be grateful if anyone else could.

C26/27.053: There were no information items.

There being no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.54pm.

Chairman