

# UPDATE SHEET

## Scrutiny Committee for Community, Leisure & Parking

For its meeting on Wednesday 28 September 2022 (Rescheduled) relating to the H&SC PC Community Governance Review - Final Recommendations Report

---

1. With apologies to the Committee and to Sayers Common Village Society (SCVS) it has come to light that SCVS did provide a submission to the second stage of the CGR public consultation within the required timescale, and that owing to an administrative error this was not considered at the time of writing the report.
2. For Member's information the submission follows this update sheet and appears to accept that support for a separate parish council for Sayers Common comes from those living west of the A23, rather than the entire Sayers Common parish ward, and therefore any such parish council would be for the village of Sayers Common.
3. The SCVS agrees that there is currently no certainty about the DP Review 2038 additional housing allocations in Sayers Common Village, but they feel there will be that certainty by 2025 and a further community governance review should be undertaken then without the need for a further petition. Any resulting new Parish would exist from 2027 when the Parish may have the benefit of additional precepts from the new housing. SCVS considers that these additional precepts do improve the viability of a new Parish Council.
4. Because of our findings detailed at paragraphs 22 - 25 of the committee report the principal electoral authority considers that a further CGR in 2029 is likely to be more appropriate given the time it takes to allocate sites and determine planning applications, building to commence, and homes to be occupied. We can, however, consider a review in 2025 if these matters have proceeded at unusual pace.
5. The principal electoral authority notes the attached budget and acknowledges that it does explain possible local taxation considerations and expenditure but considers that it does not detail the cost of asset and liability division.
6. It is acknowledged that the term "the petitioners" should refer to the 348 local government electors who signed the CGR petition.
7. It is confirmed that a subsequent CGR will not require a further petition as this authority can resolve to conduct a CGR two years after of the completion of the current Review.
8. Accordingly, the principal electoral authority is not revising its Final Recommendations for Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council set out at paragraphs 27 – 30 of your officer's report.

# **MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2021-22**

## **SUBMISSION UNDER PUBLIC CONSULTATION 2**

**BY**

**SAYERS COMMON VILLAGE SOCIETY**

**Commentary on MSDC Democratic Services' Report 25 May 2022.**

**Paras 14, 15, 18, 29 and 36.**

We attach a draft Concurrent Functions Budget for 2022 -23 and a start-up expenses budget on the basis of the existing Ward boundaries.

We carefully considered your 31 May email suggestion that a separate budget be prepared for a Ward comprising the community west of the A23. However, we found that whilst a reduction in Precept would obviously result with a corresponding increase in the tax rates for the reduced community, the reduction in Concurrent Functions would be so insignificant as to be totally discountable.

Please refer to the Budget Notes and Exposition.

**Paras 28 and 33.**

We believe that have demonstrated the financial sustainability of a stand-alone Sayers Common Parish Council to dispel your concerns on this issue and we turn to the matter of the implications of the District Plan Review 2038. We are persuaded by your argument that a Review decision be paused until a clearer image of the impact on our villages emerges. We would support a proposal that District "should consider (it) afresh" if the suggested 2025 date can be agreed as the appropriate timeframe. This subject to the confirmation that Mr Stanley gave Mr Jee by telephone that this would not involve a new petition.

**Brief commentary on the H&SCPC "Response to Draft Recommendations".**

**Point 1** – The principal DPR 2038 threat of substantial development affecting Sayers Common Ward is on its boundary with Albourne and not Hurstpierpoint. It is not, therefore, a valid reason for delaying the granting of the petition for degrouping from the latter.

**Point 2** – We are submitting a draft budget. Presumably a corresponding one will be formulated for Hurstpierpoint Ward.

**Point 3** – One of the reasons for the difficulty the present Council is experiencing in recruiting new Members is the commitment required. The substantial, and growing, number of committees, panels and working groups requires a member to attend a meeting at least once a week with attendant preparation time. The ability to give so much time should be determined at the outset **and not after** preliminary interview, presenting to Council and being formally co-opted as happened in the apparently mismanaged example cited.

**Point 5** – How can the Council reconcile its claim to review “.... every submission to identify any areas that the Parish Council could collectively improve upon...” with its rejection and challenging of your recommendation? The reality is that its unquestioning belief in its infallibility is a major obstacle to change and progress.

**Point 6** – The Parish Council’s resistance to degrouping is better understood if it is acknowledged that cross-ward subsidising of ambitious Hurstpierpoint projects would be lost.

The Council has already had three years in which to undertake Service Continuity Contingency Planning and is now suggesting that even a decision to delay to 2029 (effectively to 2031 elections) – a further nine years, would be insufficient for it to plan for its changed mandate.

**We thank you for receiving this submission and would be grateful for official notification of the outcome.**

Michael Bailey,  
Chairman,  
Sayers Common Village Society.

30 July 2022

**SAYERS COMMON PARISH COUNCIL**  
**DRAFT BUDGET 2022-23**

<b>BUDGET HEAD</b>	<b>BUDGET</b>		<b>START UP BUDGET</b>
<b>Administration</b>			
Clerk's remuneration	6200		
Payroll expenses	150		
Clerk's Expenses	500		
Members' training.	350		700
Members' expenses	150		
Hall hire	300		
Stationery	50		350
Recruitment	50		500
IT Equipment	100		900
Refreshments	150		
Info. Comm	50		
Internal audit fees	300		
External audit fees	500		
Insurances	1050		
Election expenses	0		500
Subscriptions to SALC/NALC	450		
Planning issues	1000		
Prof fees	250	Legal	3000
<b>Maintenance</b>			
Website maintenance	250	Design	500
Street light maintenance	1000		
Street light elec.	2500		
Grit bins/winter management	500		
Recreation Ground	2500		
Village Gateways	300		
Christmas street lights	1800		
Street furniture	100		
Bus shelters	150		
Notice boards	50		
<b>Micellaneous.</b>			
Induction & publications	250		500
Road traffic issues	3000		
Grants	1000		
Contingencies/projects	10000		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£ 35,000</b>		<b>£ 6,950</b>

**Notes**

- The budgets are based on the ownership of the following being transferred  
Reeds Lane recreation ground, village gateways x 3, christmas lights x 9,  
Street bench x 1, bus shelters x 2 and notice boards x 2.

- 2            The Start up Budget professional fees item relates to conveyancing legal fees.

**Commentary**

- 1            On the basis of the anticipated economies of degrouping the existing Ward Band D rate would be reduced from £88.09 to £63.95.
- 2            On the basis of the Ward being reduced to west of the A23 the Band D rate would increase from £88.09 to £93.25.
- 3            Band D east of A23 parishioners would pay £88.09 instead of £63.95 but gain no additional benefits.
- 4            Exposition:  
The average tax band of properties east of the A23 is higher than that of the existing Ward.  
The Ward area east of the A23 is low maintenance budgetwise. The principal heads of cost arise in the village centre.