

**Minutes of a meeting of Scrutiny Committee for Community,  
Customer Services and Service Delivery  
held on Wednesday, 25th May, 2022  
from 7.00 - 7.59 pm**

**Present:** Anthea Lea (Chair)  
A Boutrup (Vice-Chair)

R Cartwright  
P Chapman  
R Clarke  
J Dabell

B Dempsey  
R Eggleston  
S Ellis  
B Forbes

I Gibson  
T Hussain  
J Llewellyn-Burke  
R Whittaker

**Absent:** Councillors J Edwards, M Pulfer, A Sparasci and D Sweatman

**Also Present:** Councillors R De Mierre, N Webster

**1 TO NOTE SUBSTITUTES IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE  
RULE 4 -SUBSTITUTES AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES ETC.**

Councillor Eggleston substituted for Councillor Sparasci, Councillor Forbes substituted for Councillor Pulfer and Councillor Whittaker substituted for Councillor Sweatman.

**2 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies were received from Councillors Edwards, Pulfer, Sparasci and Sweatman. Apologies were also received from observing Cabinet Members Councillors Belsey and Cromie.

**3 TO RECEIVE DECLARATION OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS IN RESPECT OF  
ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA.**

Councillor Eggleston declared a personal interest in Item 8: Community Governance Review – of Burgess Hill Town Council and consequential impact for Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council as he is the Leader of Burgess Hill Town Council.

Councillor Gibson declared a personal interest in Item 6: Community Governance Review – Draft Recommendations for Worth Parish Council as he a Member of Worth Parish Council and a CGR proposer. He considered that interest to be prejudicial and confirmed he would therefore leave the Chamber for that item.

Councillor Cartwright declared a personal interest in Item 8: Community Governance Review – of Burgess Hill Town Council and consequential impact for Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council as he is a Member of Burgess Hill Town Council.

Councillor Chapman declared a personal interest in Item 8: Community Governance Review – of Burgess Hill Town Council and consequential impact for Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council as he is a Member of Burgess Hill Town Council.

**4 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON 23 MARCH 2022.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2022 were agreed as a correct record and electronically signed by the Chairman.

**5 TO CONSIDER ANY ITEMS THAT THE CHAIRMAN AGREES TO TAKE AS URGENT BUSINESS.**

The Chairman had no urgent business.

Councillor Gibson removed himself from the meeting at 7.03pm

**6 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WORTH PARISH COUNCIL.**

Terry Stanley, Business Unit Leader for Democratic Services, introduced the report which following the completion of the first of two public consultations, explains the findings of the first consultation. The report includes the resulting draft recommendations for Worth Parish Council as set out at p.13 of the report, and he proposed that these should form the basis of the second consultation. He gave thanks to all public participants and elected representatives for the comprehensive written contributions submitted to the Review.

The Chairman thanked the Business Unit Leader and took Members to a debate on the item.

A Member sought clarification on the cost to separate Crawley Down Parish Council and Worth Parish Council.

The Business Unit Leader for Democratic Services confirmed there was a considerable disparity in the suggested cost of splitting the two Councils, which as a result informs the recommendation, that Worth Parish Council and the proposers supply to this Review an accurate assessment of division costs with evidential annotations to support these. He confirmed that conversations between Crawley Down and Worth Parish Council were ongoing to obtain this, and he suggested deferring the start of the second part of the consultation by one week, from 6<sup>th</sup> June 2022 to 13<sup>th</sup> June 2022, to enable the two campaign entities to agree the costs, therefore providing better information for the purpose of the 2<sup>nd</sup> public consultation.

The Chairman asked whether this would affect the two-month consultation period. The Business Unit Leader confirmed this would not affect the consultation timeline, publishing the final recommendations on 6<sup>th</sup> September for presentation to this Committee on 14<sup>th</sup> September.

In response to a Member asking whether there would be staffing costs involved in separating the two Councils, the Business Unit Leader advised there would be an impact depending on staff transferring, potential redundancies and recruitment.

A Member referred to the draft recommendation at point 41 of the report and asked if it were possible that the final recommendation following the second consultation could include a recommendation for two separate Councils and include a reduction in the number of Parish Councillors as part of the process. The Business Unit Leader confirmed that a second consultation with more comprehensive information could indeed affect the final recommendation. He advised Councillor numbers could also be considered as part of the second stage review.

Members discussed the status of the Royal Oak Pub and management of the building. A Member asked if it was an Asset of Community Value. The Business Unit Leader referred to the concerns of both the residents and Councillors noted at paragraph 16 of the report as part of the consultation process, and he confirmed the building was privately owned, so unlikely to be matter that MSDC can assist with.

A Member queried the criteria for separating a Council and the legal guidance involved. The Business Unit Leader advised that Mid Sussex District Council follows I government guidance on the conduct of CGRs and in accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

The Chairman confirmed that no other Members wished to speak and took Members to the vote on the recommendations set out at 3.i, 3.iii and 3.iv (p.9) to note the recommendations. This was agreed unanimously with 13 in favour.

The Chairman introduced the recommendation 3.ii (p.9) and proposed amendment to delay the consultation by one week from 6<sup>th</sup> June 2022 to 13<sup>th</sup> June 2022. The Chairman took Members to the vote on the amendment to 3.ii which was agreed unanimously with 13 in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

The Scrutiny Committee for Community, Customer Services and Service Delivery agreed to:

- (i) Note the findings of the first public consultation.
- (ii) To provide advice upon, and further to that advice, to agree the principal electoral authority's draft recommendations for Worth Parish Council, upon which a second public consultation would be conducted (as amended).
- (iii) To note that following the second public consultation, further findings and the final recommendations of the principal electoral authority will be presented to this committee on 14 September 2022.
- (iv) To note the final decision will be taken by Council in the light of the consultation responses received through the Community Governance Review

Councillor Gibson returned to the meeting at 7.27pm

## **7 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HURSTPIERPOINT & SAYERS COMMON PARISH COUNCIL.**

Terry Stanley, Business Unit Leader for Democratic Services, introduced the report which following the completion of the first of two public consultations, explains the findings of the first consultation. The report includes the resulting draft recommendations for Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Council as set out at p.13 of

the report, and he proposed that these should form the basis of the second consultation. He gave thanks to all public participants and elected representatives for the comprehensive written contributions submitted to the Review.

The Chairman stated for transparency that a representation had been received from Sayers Common Village Society and she suggested that it should be submitted as part of the second stage public consultation. Another Member confirmed he had also received this representation and a further representation via his Group Leader. He proposed forwarding it to the Chairman for a consistent response to be given, which the Chairman agreed would be done.

Members discussed the finding that a financially sustainable Parish Council was not sufficiently evidenced when there are other smaller Parish Councils in the area, along with the possibility following the consultation responses that fewer Parish Councils might improve working relationships, and the divide caused by the A27. The Business Unit Leader explained that better and further information on the budget was required at the second consultation stage for the public to be able to make informed submissions. He advised noting the consultation responses from Ward Members and that a further Community Governance Review could be necessary in the future.

A Member queried the Council tier system in place when Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Councils are in different Wards. Tom Clark, Head of Regulatory Services and Solicitor advised it was too early to confirm or predict the outcome and Sayers Common is probably currently too small to form an independent Parish Council.

A Member noted the points at paragraphs 32 and 33 of the draft recommendations and the role of Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC). Officers confirmed that MSDC would advise the Parish Council as part of the process, however, the decision as to how or to what extent to implement our draft recommendation, is a matter for the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Parish Council.

The Chairman took Members to the vote on the recommendations set out at 3.i, 3.iii and 3. iv (p.17) to note the recommendations and 3.ii in relation to the draft recommendations set out at points 27 – 34. These were agreed unanimously with 14 in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

The Committee for Community, Customer Services and Service Delivery agreed to:

- (i) Note the findings of the first public consultation.
- (ii) To provide advice upon, and further to that advice, to agree the principal electoral authority's draft recommendations for Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council, upon which a second public consultation would be conducted.
- (iii) To note that following the second public consultation, further findings and the final recommendations of the principal electoral authority will be presented to this committee on 14 September 2022.
- (iv) To note the final decision will be taken by Council in the light of the consultation responses received through the Community Governance Review.

**8 DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF BURGESS HILL TOWN COUNCIL AND CONSEQUENTIAL IMPACT FOR ANSTY & STAPLEFIELD PARISH COUNCIL.**

Terry Stanley, Business Unit Leader for Democratic Services reminded Members that this item was presented at the last Committee meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> March. The Committee had advised that it be deferred until 2025. Subsequently, pursuant to the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 Mid Sussex District Council received a CGR Petition. Upon validation of the petition, the CGR was started, and the required Terms of Reference are the subject of consultation with the Committee now.

The Chairman thanked the Business Unit Leader for Democratic Services and asked Members to debate the item.

A Member asked for clarity for the benefit of viewers and listeners, why it had been agreed that Item 6 be deferred, and Item 8 was not. The Business Unit Leader for Democratic Services explained the consultation was already underway for Item 6, however, the review of Burgess Hill Town Council was not, and the petition has compelled MSDC to commence this Review. He confirmed the resulting draft recommendations would be presented to this Committee at its meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2022.

A Member noted the number for bank holidays in the 6-week consultation and asked whether this would affect the consultation period. The Business Unit Leader for Democratic Services confirmed this would not unduly impact the consultation and noted that the number of non-working days might give residents more opportunity to submit responses.

The Chairman took Members to the vote to approve the recommendations as set out in the report. This was agreed unanimously with 14 in favour.

**RESOLVED**

The Committee for Community, Customer Services and Service Delivery agreed to:

- (i) Note and agree the Terms of Reference and Guidance for Respondents, which have been the subject of consultation with statutory consultees.
- (ii) To authorise the Head of Regulatory Services to make amendments to Terms of Reference if additional matters arise, and as otherwise may prove necessary in consultation with the committee's Chairman, during the period of the CGRs.
- (iii) And to note that a further report will be provided as this Council's draft and final recommendations are available at later stages of the Review.
- (iv) To note the final decision will be taken by Council in the light of the consultation responses received through the Community Governance Review.

**9 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR COMMUNITY, CUSTOMER SERVICES AND SERVICE DELIVERY WORK PROGRAMME 2022/23.**

Tom Clark, Head of Regulatory Services and Solicitor to the Council, introduced the Work Programme for 2022/23 informing Members that Cabinet responsibilities had changed following Annual Council 11<sup>th</sup> May 2022, therefore business at this Committee and other Committees may change.

The Chairman requested on behalf of the Committee an update on the 1-2-3 Collection Service Trial before February 2023 and to receive a report on the status of the Leisure Centres contract. The Head of Regulatory Services and Solicitor advised given the change in Cabinet responsibilities it was not confirmed if Waste would sit with this Committee, once confirmed a report would be supplied to the correct Committee. He confirmed a report on the status of the Leisure Centres contract would be included.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendation contained in the report, this was agreed unanimously with 14 in favour.

**10 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.2 DUE NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN.**

None.

The meeting finished at 7.59 pm

Chairman