

MINUTES of the COMMUNITY RESOURCES COMMITTEE held in the NEW MILLENNIUM CHAMBER, MANOR HOUSE, CHURCH STREET, LITTLEHAMPTON on THURSDAY 17 JULY 2014 at 6.30PM

Present: Cllrs Neno (Vice-Chair in the Chair),
Ayes, Britton, Emberson, Millam and
Dr Walsh KStJ

Cllr Hulmes attended as a substitute for Cllr Caffyn

2014/2015

15. EVACUATION PROCEDURES

The evacuation procedures were noted.

16. FILMING OF COUNCIL MEETINGS AND USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

The Chair explained the rules for the filming of Council meetings and the use of social media.

17. MOBILE PHONES

Members and the public were reminded that the use of mobile phones (other than on silent) was prohibited at Town Council and Committee meetings.

18. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Belchamber MBE and Caffyn.

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and Officers were reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary or personal and/or prejudicial interests that they might have in relation to items on the Agenda. Councillors Neno, Emberson, Dr Walsh KstJ and Britton declared personal interests with regard to the item that was arising as an Urgent Item regarding the Swimming Pool as Members of Arun District Council. Councillors Emberson and Dr Walsh KstJ were also Members of the Leisure Infrastructure and Tourism Working Group at the District Council. With regard to the item on the Ferry that was to be considered under Urgent Items, Councillor Dr Walsh KstJ declared a personal interest as a Member of Littlehampton Harbour Board.

20. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5th June 2014 (previously circulated) were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

21. CHAIR'S REPORT AND URGENT ITEMS

21.1 Littlehampton Swimming and Sports Centre

The Town Clerk informed Members that he had received a request for the Town Council to support a petition that was being prepared by the Charter

Group and Civic Society calling on Arun District Council to halt their plans to demolish the current Littlehampton Swimming and Sports Centre and hold further consultation with the local community regarding the way forward. Members were supportive of this and as long as it was a non-party political campaign agreed that the Council should support it. Councillor Dr Walsh KstJ and the Town Clerk then went on to explain to Members the current position with regard to the District Council's proposals for delivering a new swimming pool in the town. A revised report was to be considered by the District Council's Cabinet on 21st July, which still leaned towards a preferred site to the west of Daisyfields Caravan site. Councillor Dr Walsh KstJ also confirmed that he had spoken with the relevant County Council Cabinet Member regarding the availability of the County Council's land for this proposal. From these discussions, he understood that this land was not available. He also emphasised that the proposals flew in the face of all public consultations that had previously taken place and therefore proposed that the Town Council write to the District Council re-affirming their strong position on this matter. This was duly seconded and it was **RESOLVED** that:

1. The Town Clerk write to the District Council re-affirming the Town Council's position on the proposals regarding the Littlehampton Swimming and Sports Centre.

2. The Town Council support a non-party political petition as proposed by the Charter Group and Civic Society opposing the relocation of the Littlehampton Swimming and Sports Centre and the building of flats/housing on the seafront.

21.2 Littlehampton Ferry

The Town Clerk reported that he had not been expecting the Ferry to operate in 2014. However, recent developments meant that there was a possibility that the service could indeed operate through the latter part of July and August. Together with the Finance and Resources Manager, he was continuing these discussions and an urgent decision could be required in the near future. He sought delegated authority to progress this and it was **RESOLVED** that:

Delegated authority be granted to the Town Clerk, and in his absence the Finance and Resources Manager, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee to progress the Littlehampton Ferry service for 2014.

22. PUBLIC FORUM

Members of the public were invited to ask questions or raise issues which were relevant and the concern of the Committee.

Mr Mark Wilson spoke with regard to the proposal to remove cockerels from the allotment sites. He stated that he had had a cockerel for some thirteen years and that his plot was some one hundred and fifty yards from the nearest

house. Whilst he accepted that they did create noise, he thought that this was less than the noise made by seagulls, wood pigeons and magpies. He thought it was unfair and unkind to blame the cockerels. Indeed, the new road that would be built shortly would be far noisier than any of these birds. Mr Alan Martin, another local person, contended that there was a cockerel being housed in Toddington Lane which was crowing in the morning. This was much nearer the housing and it was thought that perhaps the nuisance was being created by this cockerel.

A lady who worked night shifts stated that she had never heard any noise of the cockerels from the allotment site and thought that any proposal to remove them was unfair.

Mr Martin referred to someone on the Toddington estate that was feeding seagulls and other birds which was causing considerable nuisance.

Mr Humphrey of LALGA did not believe that noise from the allotment site was a nuisance and that only minor mitigation was required by householders.

Reference was also made to a statement that the control of noise pollution with regard to cockerels should not apply in a rural environment.

Mr Adam-Smith stated that the allotments were in a rural area and therefore it made no sense to ban cockerels from the allotment sites. It was also questioned why such a response was required when only one person had complained.

23. OFFICER'S REPORT

23.1 Allotment Working Group Review of Permission for Plot Holders to Keep Cockerels

23.1.1 The Committee considered a report (previously circulated) which set out recommendations from the Allotments Working Group regarding the keeping of cockerels on Town Council allotment sites. The Town Clerk explained that there was an error in the recommendation and that Fort Road should not have been included on the list of sites where the keeping of hens was allowed. The Town Clerk outlined the reasons behind the recommendation from the Working Group and explained that the permission to allow cockerels was probably an error dating back many years. The relative legislation referred to the keeping of hens, which had been incorrectly incorporated in the rules as chickens, thereby permitting cockerels.

23.1.2 In response to a number of questions, the Clerk explained that the Council could not decide to deliberately break the law and that the letter from the District Council was intended as a way for an aggrieved person to resolve the issue prior to any legal action. However, should Members reasonably decide that they did not believe that they were responsible for the noise or that the noise was below actionable thresholds, then they could resolve not to remove cockerels. Members debated the issue at length and thought that both the distance of the cockerels on the site from the residential area and the possibility that another cockerel was creating the nuisance within the estate meant that it would be improper to ban cockerels at this stage. However, should the District Council find that the Town Council's allotment site was creating a noise nuisance, then cockerels would need to be banned from the allotment sites. It was also thought that the amount of other noise from birdlife including seagulls etc was far greater than the noise of the cockerels in the early morning.

Members also discussed whether it was appropriate at this stage to ban any new cockerels being brought onto the site and thought that at this stage this was not necessary. However it was agreed that a further report would be considered at the next meeting of the Committee. It was agreed to clarify that hens would be permitted on the Town Council allotment sites at Mill Lane, Worthing Road, Trinidad, Kingley Gate and North Littlehampton. It was therefore **RESOLVED** that:

1. It be agreed that cockerels not be banned from Town Council allotment sites with immediate effect as there was compelling evidence that both the distance from residential areas and the possibility of their being another cockerel nearer to those houses it was likely that a noise nuisance was not being created from the allotments. Should it be proven otherwise, it was agreed that cockerels would be banned with immediate effect.

2. New cockerels not be banned from the sites pending a further report to the next meeting of the Committee.

3. The keeping of chickens on the following Town Council allotment sites only be permitted; - Mill Lane, Worthing Road, Trinidad, Kingley Gate and North Littlehampton.

23.2 Museum Periodic Report

The Committee considered the latest periodic report covering the Museum (previously circulated) which gave information on recent Museum events and exhibitions; an update on the new Museum website and set out the Museum visitor outreach figures. It was **RESOLVED** that:

The report be noted.

23.3 Project 82 Periodic Report

The Committee considered a report (previously circulated) which set out details of the plans for Project 82 for the school summer holidays; gave an update on the sexual health clinic at Project 82 and also updated on the outreach sessions. It was **RESOLVED** that:

The report be noted.

23.4 Project 82/Keystone Centre

The Town Clerk stated that he had no updates to give at this stage.

24. FINANCE

24.1 Finance Report 2014/15

The Committee considered the latest periodic finance report (previously circulated) which highlighted significant variances from budget and income

and expenditure relating to the Community Resources Committee budget for 2014/15. It was **RESOLVED** that:

The report be noted.

25. MASTERPLAN – NORTH LITTLEHAMPTON

The Town Clerk reported that he was continuing to have discussions with the County Council and the developers with regard to the future provisions of bus services that would be funded from the new development. Councillor Dr Walsh KstJ referred to the recent North Littlehampton Steering Group meeting where it had been stated that the Lyminster by-pass would hopefully be linked to the A259 road improvements.

26. EXEMPT BUSINESS

There was none.

The meeting closed at 7.26pm

CHAIR