



EAST PRESTON PARISH COUNCIL

Council Office, 122 Sea Road, East Preston, West Sussex. BN16 1NN

Tel: 01903 770050

www.arun.gov.uk/eastpreston

Email: asstclerk@eastpreston-pc.gov.uk

AMENITIES COMMITTEE

MINUTES: of the Proceedings of the Meeting of the Amenities Committee held on 11th August 2025 at 19.00, at East Preston Infant School, Lashmar Road, East Preston.

PRESENT: Councillor S Wilkinson (Chairman), Councillor S Toney (Vice-Chairman) Councillor's R McElroy, K Bradshaw, B Gale, C Bowman and E Linton.

ALSO: Dawn Reid (Assistant Clerk to the Council)
Simon Cross (Clerk to the Council)
D Jull S Hodgson
G Smith V Smith
R Finnigan A Finnigan
B Lemin T Lemin

APOLOGIES: No apologies.

The meeting opened at 19:00, Councillor Wilkinson (Chairman) welcomed the attendees.

623/25 INTRODUCTIONS

Cllr Wilkinson welcomed all those present. A round of introductions took place.

624/25 APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE

No apologies were received.

625/25 PERSONAL AND/OR PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

Councillor Wilkinson asked councillors to declare any Personal/Prejudicial Interest prior to the agenda item being discussed.

Councillor Gale declared a personal interest in all agenda items relating to Warren Recreation Ground. Councillor Gale lives in a property adjacent to the recreation ground.

626/25 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Due to all being present to discuss all agenda items questions would take place at the time when the agenda item was being discussed. Councillor Wilkinson moved agenda item 6a) The Playing of Cricket, to the end of the agenda for discussion.

627/25 WARREN RECREATION GROUND – 6a) The misuse of the Tennis Court.

The committee NOTED the following paper which had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

Following the discussions at the May Amenities meeting regarding the misuse of the tennis court for the playing of football, and the accompanying antisocial behaviour being endured by neighbours. The Clerk and I have been investigating what could be done to combat this. The following are some of what has been investigating since this issue was raised:

1. Contacted Sussex Police to ask if they could attend and they said they will when they can.
2. Contacted ADC Anti-Social Behaviour team, who are under staffed and over stretched and could not guarantee attending before the end of the summer.
3. Biffa to unlock and lock the gate daily – Contacted Biffa to see if their operative would be willing to spend an extra few minutes in the village each morning and evening, unlocking and locking the tennis court, at the same time as he unlocks and locks the toilets. Biffa has said it is not possible.
4. Key code locking system – If a system can be installed users could obtain the access code by calling the council office or via the council's website. The code can be changed at regular periods to help prevent misuse. I contacted Arun Security Centre regarding a quote for this work and was advised, 'due to the type of older gate it would not be possible to install a key coded lock'. Arun Security Centre suggested either contacting a blacksmith to ask if they can somehow weld something in place to accommodate a key code lock, although they were not very positive this would actually work. He suggested replacing the gate with one which incorporates the lock.
I met with Steve Hodgson on site regarding the possibility of altering the existing gate. Steve said he could try and weld something in place but he is not entirely sure how it would work. Steve asked me to provide ideas of the locking systems and he will see if it can be done.
I spoke to New Place Fencing, regarding advice and a quote for replacement box section gate. We also discussed the possibility of extending the fencing height to help prevent unwanted access.
5. Key holder at a Local business – A local business could act as a key holder. This would require the key holder to agree to keep a record of who had collected the key, just in case it was not returned. The hours of business may limit the availability.
6. On line booking system – In conjunction with a key code locking system, use an online booking system as used at Maltravers Park and Norfolk Gardens courts in Littlehampton, all of these venues charge for court usage. The booking system can be accessed through the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) and it is a free facility to its members. LTA request an annual membership fee to register and members meet its safeguarding standards. Requirements involve a Welfare Officer who can be contactable. This officer should be DBS checked and have completed a safeguarding course.

The council began receiving almost daily complaints from neighbours of anti-social behaviour and misuse of the tennis court. This problem appears to have increased significantly. With the school's summer holidays rapidly approaching the problem is only likely to get worse. As a short-term measure, the committee is asked to consider closing the tennis court for a period of time, initially a one-month period. It is hoped this temporary measure would lead the groups to finding an alternative location for playing football and make the tennis court permanently available for tennis again. Temporary closure may also unveil genuine tennis players affected by the closure. During the time the court is closed, much needed general maintenance work could be carried out: surface cleaning and the relocation of the litter bin.

The above information was electronically circulated to the committee for its consideration.

The committee VOTED and AGREED to temporarily close the tennis court for a one-month period, as a means to combat the misuse and antisocial behaviour affecting nearby properties.

Cllr Linton strongly disagreed with the temporary measure to close the court, particularly at the busiest time of year for tennis. Cllr Linton asked, as a matter of urgency the committee to revisit its decision and suggested as a temporary solution to ask a local business to be a key holder. Councillor Linton's request was circulated electronically to the committee for its consideration.

The committee reconsidered its decision and the majority AGREED to trial the following system.

Tennis court gate padlocked.

The Great Dane is a key holder.

Players are required to leave their details plus a £5.00 deposit which is returnable when the key is brought back.

Signage at the court informing players of the new system.

The above system is now in operational and to date there are no reports of misuse of the court.

At the time of writing this report the court is being used on average six times a day by genuine players. Dane, The Great Dane, said the system appears to be working well, players are returning the key and he is getting to know regular users.

Dawn Reid – Assistant Clerk to the Council

31st July 2025

Councillor Linton updated all present that since the tennis court was locked and the key holder system put in place, everything appeared to be working well. The key was being returned by users and Dane, the proprietor of The Great Dane, was getting to recognise regular players. To date the committee had not received any reports of misuse of the court.

Mr [REDACTED] informed the committee, unfortunately earlier that evening prior to the meeting, the same group of boys as reported previously had climbed over the fence. The boys told Mr [REDACTED] they were retrieving their football which had gone over into the court. Mr [REDACTED] politely told the boys they could collect the key from The Great Dane, but the court was for playing tennis only. Two girls proceeded to collect the key on behalf of the boys and they played football in the court. Mr [REDACTED] said up until this point the system had worked well and there had been no issues.

A neighbour rang The Great Dane and informed Dane the last people to collect the keys were misusing the court. Dane went over to the court and spoke to the boys and asked them to leave.

Councillor Linton told the committee that she will investigate this incident and report her findings back to the committee.

Prior to the meeting, the Assistant Clerk had updated the committee on the progress made researching alternative operating systems for the court. The Assistant Clerk highlighted the following which had been circulated prior to the meeting:

To install a new gate with key coded locking system

For supplying and fitting a new box section gate with matching posts and digi lock on both sides at the Tennis Court- £2348.00 exc VAT.

I am currently exploring the possibility of adapting the existing gate to accommodate a key code lock (see the picture below). Mr Hodgson, Steve's Yard, has offered to adapt the gate. He said he could remove the gate and adapt it at his workshop to accommodate this type of lock. I would need to obtain details of Mr Hodgson's insurance cover for this type of metal work.

[Borg BL3030 2 Sided Coded Gate Lock To Suit 30-60mm](#)



Booking System - In conjunction with a key code locking system, the committee will need to consider the use an online booking system, as used at Maltravers Park and Norfolk Gardens courts in Littlehampton. For the committee's information all of these venues charge for court usage. The booking system can be accessed through the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA), it is a free facility to its members. LTA request an annual membership fee to register and members must meet its safeguarding standards. Requirements involve a Welfare Officer who can be contactable, further details of this role are awaited. This officer should be

DBS checked and have completed a safeguarding course. Following my conversation with James Deem LTA, James advised, 'the annual membership registration fee would be zero cost due to the council only having one tennis court'. The safeguarding standards are the part requiring attention. James advised to discuss this with ADC if they can perform the function of a point of welfare contact for the court, if not this would be managed locally and it would involve a person in the council doing a three-hour safeguarding course and completing an LTA DBS check.

The committee thanked the Assistant Clerk for her progress to date and it will await further updates in due course.

Mr [REDACTED] informed the committee that he would be willing to co-operate should the committee wish to install CCTV at the area. Mr [REDACTED] advised there is the facility to run the CCTV from his electric supply.

Councillor McElroy advised the committee, it would be easy to install CCTV at the area. Councillor McElroy offered his expert knowledge on this subject.

The committee AGREED whilst considering a longer-term operating system for the tennis court, to also consider installing CCTV.

628/25 WARREN RECREATION GROUND – 6a) The Outdoor Gym Equipment.

The committee NOTED the following paper which had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

Councillor McElroy and I recently met to discuss the Outdoor Gym equipment proposal with a view to presenting to the committee a plan and recommendation for moving forward with the project. Councillor McElroy suggested the committee consider placing the Outdoor Gym equipment project on hold until the current issues relating to Warren Recreation Ground are resolved. Councillor McElroy believes with all the current issues focused at Warren Recreation Ground, this is not the most appropriate time for this project.

The committee VOTED and AGREED to pause the Outdoor Gym Equipment project until the issues relating to Warren Recreation Ground are resolved.

Councillor McElroy advised the committee, based on the recent ROSPA Inspection Report's findings the committee will need to consider if the current equipment is safe for use.

Dawn Reid – Assistant Clerk to the Council

30th July 2025

Councillor Wilkinson informed the members of the public that the committee had agreed the Outdoor Gym Equipment proposal has been placed on hold.

The Assistant Clerk updated the committee, as agreed, due to the mechanism failure the Double Air Walker unit had been closed. Until Cloud 9 is able to install safety fencing, the unit has been wrapped with hazard warning tape. A sign has been attached informing members of the public the unit is no longer in use.

Mr [REDACTED] informed the committee that the safety fencing had been installed earlier that day.

The Assistant Clerk advised the committee she is in the process of obtaining quotes for the removal and disposal of the Double Air Walker .

The committee NOTED, due to a mechanism failure the Double Air Walker unit had been closed.

The committee thanked the Assistant Clerk for her update and will await further updates in due course.

629/25 WARREN RECREATION GROUND – 6a) The Playing of Cricket.

The committee NOTED the following paper which had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

The council has been informed by residents of Sea Lane and Sea Road they have revived the Warren Recreation Ground Safety Group. The group would like to speak to the council about concerns it has about various matters on the Warren Recreation Ground, but primarily the playing of cricket and instances where the group feels East Preston Cricket Club has breached the terms of the licence issued by the parish council.

The group is concerned the Warren Recreation Ground is well below the suggested dimensions for a cricket pitch. According to Wikipedia, "there are no fixed dimensions for the field but its diameter usually varies between 450 and 500 feet (140 and 150 m) for men's cricket". The same Wikipedia page says the following dimensions apply to international men's matches, "With respect to the size of the boundaries, no boundary shall be longer than 90 yards (82 metres), and no boundary should be shorter than 65 yards (59 metres) from the centre of the pitch to be used.", but international cricket is not played in East Preston. "In addition, the conditions require a minimum three-yard gap between the "rope" and the surrounding fencing or advertising boards. This allows players to dive without risk of injury." The RoSPA report commissioned in 2019 stated, "The cricket field, including its surrounds and the space occupied by the pavilion is approximately 125 metres long by 85 metres wide." These figures fall short of the diameter mentioned above. A very rough calculation shows if the pitch is in the middle of the recreation ground, there is only 42½ metres to the east and west boundaries, and 62½ metres to the south and north boundaries.

One suggestion from the group is to ban players from hitting sixes because of the risk of damage to property and passers-by. In July 2024, this report appeared in The Guardian - <https://www.theguardian.com/sport/article/2024/jul/22/west-sussex-cricket-club-bans-players-hitting-sixes-damage-complaints>. Both Southwick and Shoreham Cricket Club and East Preston Cricket Club play in the Sussex Cricket League – East Preston in Division 7 West and Southwick and Shoreham in Division 8 Central. I have contacted the Sussex Cricket League for comment and have received nothing beyond an initial acknowledgement and that was received on 16th June. In the past, we have been told clubs implementing such a rule would not be allowed to continue playing in the league, but as of 2nd August, Southwick and Shoreham appear to be playing in the league still.

There have been a few news stories this summer about clubs being temporarily suspended because of incidents, for example:

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c3d47dz475vo>

I have contacted my counterpart at Danbury Parish Council for further information.

The parish council provides a licence to the cricket club to play on the Warren Recreation Ground (circulated with these Supporting Papers). In an email dated 13/06, the safety group raised the following concerns **the club has contravened the terms of the licence in the following ways:**

Section 5...I won't write it here but in essence " the EPCC MUST take all reasonable steps to prevent injury to persons/damage to property to the reasonable satisfaction of the EPPC" That Simon is just not happening. For years people " average " people have been highlighting the ever-increasing dangers and risks of injury and damage to property. You have risk assessments recommending mitigating works to reduce medium and high risks and it appears none of it has been followed.

Section 6...does the EPCC have insurance? Have you seen it? Does it provide sufficient cover? Is it predicated on following fulfilling the terms of the licence and recommendations of risk assessments? is that happening? Can you send me a copy please?

Section 7...the EPCC can have an insurance policy but if they breach the conditions , as mentioned above the policy is valid and void and the EPPC will become vicariously liable and in fact will be implicit as the EPPC may be considered not to have been enforcing the licence between the EPCC and the EPPC....you need to watch this Simon....

Section 10...a lot of the time when a cricket match is on, either the opposing team or the home team have young guests and visitors with them. They can't use the field because of the cricket, so instead they play football up against my boundary fence. The EPCC seems to think this is okay and I have to keep asking the children to stop whilst the adults look on. The attitude is amazing. The parents wouldn't allow their own house boundary fence to be used as a backstop for a football goal so why should mine...the section says "the club agrees and UNDERTAKES NOT TO CAUSE TO BE DONE ANY ACT OR THING which..maybe or BECOME A NUISANCE or inconvenience or annoyance TO THE COUNCIL OR OTHER PERSON"...it took me several phone calls at one stage to a club official who asked me " how do you know it's down to the cricket club". I replied " well the cricket club players are all looking on and the "football players" are all wearing cricket whites" the date was 19th May 2024. The excuse was it was the away teams boys...maybe so but still a breach of the licence. It happened again on 30th June. This is a breach that is easily remedied, if the EPCC took its licence seriously and stopped expecting residents to enforce the licence, and actually enforced it themselves....not that difficult to ask their own players opposing team to stop using the boundary fence as a backstop!!!! It just shows the attitude towards the enforcement of the licence conditions to play cricket on the WRG.

Section 13...." EPCC will review annually the measures taken to prevent injury damage..." is there proof of this Simon? Can we see the written proof that this takes place every year? It says any reasonable " changes that are deemed necessary are to be implemented"...not from what I can see from the risk assessments?

Section 15..this is important. if a ball is hit out of the ground then " a senior member of the EPCC will visit the property to ascertain if the ball has caused damage or injury and to recover the cricket ball". In my property this has happened

once and once only. I have given you 4 cricket balls 2 found in my property. No one came round to check and no one came and collected the balls. The other two balls I gave you we can assume the same (ie no one bothered to check) based on the fact I had to give you the balls...I know that 25A have also had balls in their garden and no one came round to check or collect the balls. This is also true of 23A where two balls were found in their hedge. This Simon is again very sound proof of breach of EPCC licence and most probably the insurance cover which will invalidate the insurance. Someone could be lying unconscious for ages before anyone notices if the EPCC doesn't fulfil the condition of its licence by coming to check?

Section 16..i have raised this in the Amenities meeting and will not cover it here. This is the EPCC responsibility to ensure no damage and to effect repair without delay...its not down to residents to chase and pay up front and argue with the EPCC to get them to do what they are contractually obliged to do. Again this is a breach if they do not follow their responsibilities under this section. This is a no brainer Simon under contract law.....

Section 18. I will await your response to the FOI but we know this is not happening. In addition if it is not reported its a significant breach of the terms of the licence and just once will invalidate the insurance because if one is not reported then how can you trust how many are actually being reported....and we know that some aren't...If not reported it means EPPC cannot take an informed decision about enforcing or cancelling the licence. This is a small section but a big impact Simon.

Section 20...you are getting to the stage Simon where the EPPC needs to consider its position and may well have to start implementing this clause to protect itself against court action.

These comments have already been circulated to committee members.

Simon Cross – Clerk to the Council

29th July 2025

The following incident relating to a stray cricket ball was reported to the committee:

On Saturday 5th July, the residents of 58 Sea Road were having a family BBQ and the grandchildren were playing in the garden. At 2.32pm there was a loud bang and a cricket ball had hit the fence and was landed less than five feet away from the grandchildren. On Monday Colin, Cricket Club, called around and apologised. Colin said that if the trees had not been cut back as much it would not have happened. The neighbour has expressed his concerns to the committee that it is only a matter of time before a stray cricket ball, travelling at speed hits someone. He added, property can be repaired but it does not bear thinking about what the consequences could be if the ball had hit a person.

For the committee's information, on the same afternoon two stray cricket balls went over into number 62 Sea Road's garden.

On 26th July a stray cricket ball went over into number 62 Sea Road's garden and narrowly missed the resident's daughter.

This information has already been circulated to committee members.

Dawn Reid – Assistant Clerk to the Council

31st July 2025

Councillor Wilkinson advised Mr [REDACTED] that the committee had seen records dating back to April 2025, of all conversations held relating to the playing of cricket at the recreation ground.

Mr [REDACTED] said he didn't want to go over all these issues at this time. Mr [REDACTED] highlighted the following issues and questions which had been raised by members of the Warren Recreation Ground Safety Group:

1. ROSPA – The 2007 inspection report raised issues and recommendations were raised relating to extending the height of the safety nets at both the west and eastern boundaries. It was recommended this cost should be programmed into future budgets. The same recommendations were made in 2013, 2017 and 2019 but to date nothing has been actioned. This has serious legal implications. Since the council set up a working party in November 2020 what outcome was reached?
2. Insurance – Mr [REDACTED] believes Power Play is meant to have been disclosed by the Cricket Club to its insurers, has this been done? If not, the insurance could be invalid. Should any accident occur, it could be seen as foreseeable and therefore the council which granted the lease is not showing a duty of care and would be liable.
3. Pitch size - The size of the pitch is probably too small for senior play, the pitch is smaller than normally used for cricket standards. It is not acceptable for senior players to play on a junior size pitch, nor to strike 6's and power play. The boundary

rope is not three metres from the edge of the recreation ground. On the 2007 ROSPA inspection report it was recommended that a larger ground is sought for Senior Cricket teams to reduce the risk of injuries due to ball strikes.

4. Balls out of the ground report – the Clerk had provided a Freedom of Information report for Mr [REDACTED] which had shown 233 balls reported as landing outside the Warren Recreation Ground from the 2014 season onwards. (It should be noted only one match was played in 2020 owing to the pandemic.) The Clerk had provided an update based upon the club's returns for the 2025 season to date, and Mr [REDACTED] felt it was missing at least three incidents. The Clerk said the return was very specifically a record of balls landing outside the Warren Recreation Ground not outside the boundary. Mr [REDACTED] said the club was not checking immediately when a ball landed in a neighbouring property and whether it had caused injury or damage. Sometimes, the club does not even check on the same day. Mr [REDACTED] and Mrs [REDACTED] suggested the club's report should include reporting of the householders' comments.
5. Club Licence – There are sections within the licence where the Cricket Club is clearly not complying to what has been set out. Does the council hold a yearly meeting with the club to discuss these concerns? If the club is breaching the licence and this is not being monitored, or any actions taking place, then the council is liable.

Mr [REDACTED] raised his concerns regarding the number of balls which are being hit out of the ground and landing into the Village Hall car park. Mr [REDACTED] was extremely concerned for people's safety, especially at busy times when events are taking place. Mr [REDACTED] said he cannot believe these concerns have not been addressed.

Mr [REDACTED] reiterated the safety issue relating to when a single stray ball lands in neighbour's garden. Mr [REDACTED] grandchild had recently encountered a near miss from a stray ball and Mr [REDACTED] said there have been several other occasions where neighbours have reported a ball narrowly missing a person.

The group believes if the issues with balls being hit out of ground is not addressed immediately, then it is only a matter of time before an injury or serious accident occurs.

Mr [REDACTED] explained this is a legal issue, it is a 'Statutory Nuisance' and it goes beyond what a reasonable person would tolerate. The human rights of the neighbour's enjoyment of their own property are being infringed. Mr [REDACTED] advised, every ball which comes over into his property could be considered as reckless and it could be reported to the police and classed as criminal damage.

Mr [REDACTED] advised the committee that he wrote to Beccy Cooper, MP, regarding the concerns and he provided evidence of the safety issues which require urgent action. Mr [REDACTED] informed the committee that Beccy Cooper had replied and said it is the council's duty of care to take steps to prevent accidents happening and that she will raise this matter with the council on her next visit.

Mr [REDACTED] also spoke to the clerk at Danbury Council regarding similar issues they have been addressing. Danbury Council commissioned a ball Trajectory report. Mr Jull has asked for a copy of this report.

Councillor Wilkinson thanked Mr [REDACTED] for raising the above issues and invited the committee to respond to the points raised.

Councillor Wilkinson read out correspondence received from the Cricket Club which highlighted the club's reasons for not attending the meeting. The club said it needed time to prepare and then would discuss this matter through the following process: a club committee meeting, a meeting open to the club's whole membership, a meeting with the council as the club's landlord, a meeting with the Warren Recreation Ground Safety Group and council together.

The Clerk said he believed the club was taking the matter seriously and the club committee meeting was possibly going to take place on 12th August.

The Clerk advised the ball report is for balls going out of ground and that is why there are never many reported for the northern boundary. The Clerk said an annual post season review meeting is held with the club. Mr [REDACTED] asked the Clerk for copies of the notes from this meeting.

The Clerk advised on the 16th June 2025 he wrote to the Sussex League and received a response on 8th August 2025. The response said the league was not aware of the ban on hitting 6's at Southwick Green. This was not in place for any league matches at any time. The league would never have permitted it. The Clerk recently subsequently received an email from the Cricket League Territory Manager, who has offered his support where he can.

Councillor Bowman responded when the working party had carried out its survey, Power Play was not taking place. She was unsure if this was now a requirement to be able to stay in the league. Councillor McElroy felt if the cricket club did not operate to its procedures and processes it should be held to task.

There was a discussion on how over the years technology had changed and how this has affected how the game is now played. A discussion took place on what players interpretations of good play is and the implications of power play.

Councillor McElroy asked the group to suggest what it would like to see happen?

The following was suggested:

1. Ban striking 6's.
2. Follow recommendations in ROPSA inspection report.
3. Amalgamate with another club for senior play at a different ground.
4. Look for a bigger pitch

Several of the group said they did not want to see the playing of cricket stopped at Warren Recreation Ground and in particular the playing of junior cricket.

The committee considered all of the above suggestions and a lengthy discussion took place.

The idea of alternative sites was discussed and Langmeads site was mentioned, this had already been considered in the past. Mr [REDACTED] questioned why the suggestion to move the cricket pitch to Langmeads Recreation Ground had not been pursued. Mr [REDACTED] had calculated that, on paper, Langmeads could potentially be three times the size of the Warren Recreation Ground. Cllr Toney replied the land was Arun District Council land and not within this council's gift. Mr [REDACTED] had a letter from ADC's then Monitoring Officer suggesting ADC might consider this option. Mr [REDACTED] said it was curiously coincidental the Friends of Langmeads group of residents was set up at about the same time encouraged, he believed, by the then Chairman of the Council, Cllr Chris Roberts, who lived in a property on the southern side of Langmeads. The Clerk responded firstly the Friends of Langmeads group had been wholly an Arun District Council initiative as it was something which had already been proven to work well at Hotham Park in Bognor Regis. ADC's Monitoring Officer was only one ADC officer with input into this matter, and officers in the Parks Department had been concerned about what trees would need to be lost to make way for a cricket pitch and how that would affect the local biodiversity, albeit such a term may not have been used at the time. Clearing whichever parts of the land would need to be cleared and then preparing the land for cricket would have taken, it was estimated at the time, between five and ten years which, the Clerk conceded, would have passed by now. Cllr Bradshaw, a former cricketer, felt the playing area of a pitch on Langmeads would not actually be that much larger than the Warren Recreation Ground.

Councillor Wilkinson asked if increasing the height of the nets to a sufficient height would be a solution. The group said it would be advisable, increasing the net height was highlighted and recommended in the ROSPA inspection report. The group felt there will be some players who may see the increased height as a challenge and whose sole intention is slogging 6's out of the field. Power play needs to cease.

The committee discussed the effects of a ban on hitting 6's. The committee reviewed the current cricket seasons fixtures and there are four home games left to play, two in league one and one in league two. There is also a friendly match at home.

Councillor Wilkinson suggested the club could consider forfeiting those matches left, this could affect the club's position within the league. Councillor McElroy advised the committee, safety issues have been raised to the committee and as landlord the council has a duty of care to members of the public.

A lengthy discussion took place on both the safety issues raised, the council's duty of care and the liability insurance implications. The committee discussed how a ban on hitting 6's would work and the implication this would have for the the cricket club.

Councillor Linton raised concerns on how a ban on hitting 6's could work and how it would be policed, should a player hit a 6 at the next match and it caused damage, who would be liable for this. Councillor McElroy advised the cricket club would be liable for not ensuring the ban is implemented.

The committee took the decision to vote on implementing a ban on hitting 6's for the remainder of this season. Councillor Toney abstained from the voting. The council understands that this may create difficulties for the club with the league or even lead to forfeited matches, and this was taken into consideration before the decision was made.

The committee VOTED and AGREED with immediate effect, to implement a ban on the hitting of 6's for the remainder of the 2025 Cricket season.

Councillor Wilkinson asked the Clerk and Assistant Clerk to officially write to the cricket club informing it of the decision and to make clear the cricket clubs' liability.

The WRG Safety Group thanked the committee for listening to its concerns.

Councillor Wilkinson advised once the committee has spoken with the cricket club, it will update the group.

The date of the next meeting is 15th September 2025.

The meeting concluded at 20.20 hrs.

Chairman: *Councillor S Wilkinson*

Date: 15th September 2025