



EAST PRESTON PARISH COUNCIL

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

Tel: 01903 770050

<http://eastpreston.arun.gov.uk/>

Email: clerk@eastpreston-pc.gov.uk

FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

MINUTES: of the Meeting of the Finance and General Purposes Committee held on Tuesday, 12th May 2026 at Council Office, 122 Sea Road, East Preston at 19:00

PRESENT: Councillors John Gunston, Elizabeth Linton, Glyn Mathias, Rick McElroy (Chairman), Steve Toney and Steven Wilkinson

ALSO: Clerk to the Council, Simon Cross

Peter Dallimore and Andy Reeves, East Preston Cricket Club (both until 19:42)

Mr M (until 19:08)

The following abbreviations may appear in these Minutes:

ADC – Arun District Council;
NALC – National Association of Local Councils

WSCC – West Sussex County Council.

The meeting opened at 19:00.

Cllr McElroy welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Following the Annual Meeting of the Council on 11th May, the membership of the committee remained Cllrs Gunston, Mathias, McElroy and Wilkinson. As Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council respectively, Cllrs Toney and Linton were entitled to attend and vote at meetings of this committee.

On 6th May, the Clerk had asked members of the committee to let him know whether they wished to stand for Chairman and/or Vice-Chairman of the committee. Cllrs McElroy and Gunston had replied they were willing to stand for Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively.

The committee AGREED Cllr Wilkinson could act as second teller alongside the Clerk.

342/26 APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FOR THE YEAR 2026/27

Cllr McElroy was appointed unopposed.

Cllr Linton confirmed all six councillors present had voted.

343/26 APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE YEAR 2026/27

Cllr Gunston was appointed unopposed.

Cllr Linton confirmed all six councillors present had voted.

344/26 APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE

All committee members were present.

345/26 PERSONAL AND/OR PREJUDICIAL/PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Cllr Gunston	Grant Aid 2026/27 – East Preston Yarnbombers	Personal; Cllr Gunston is married to an East Preston Yarnbomber
Cllr Toney	Grant Aid 2026/27 – 1 st East Preston Scout Group	Personal; Cllr Toney is a member of the 1 st East Preston Scout Group

346/26 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Mr M read the following statement to the committee:

Beach Access Bottom of Sea Road East Preston

1. To build the beach access a civil or coastal engineer is required who is up to date with current legislation and is fully insured.
2. For the planning permission you had to get the landowners consent, this I believe has not been gained so construction should not have gone ahead.
3. There are no RAMS
4. There is no ROSPA report
5. All councillors who voted for the beach access to be taken over will be personally liable, even when they have stepped down from the council, as will their estate.
6. In the past a council employed a contractor who had no public liability insurance and all councillors who voted for that contractor became personally liable for failing to carry out due diligence.
Is this happening again

Cllr Gunston replied he believed all councillors had been aware of this when they had decided, for the good of the village, to accept the gift of the community boardwalk. Mr M said he believed it needed to be reiterated to all councillors.

Cllr Wilkinson argued individual councillors would not be personally liable as all had acted in good faith.

After Mr M had said the council had not dug deeply enough to establish who owned the land in question, the Clerk asked Mr M where else the council should approach for that information when Land Registry requests had failed to identify the owner of the land. Mr M said it wasn't for him to say. Cllr Linton said she felt Mr M was being obstructive rather than helpful to the council and ultimately the village.

Mr M said he thought he knew who owned the land and he might approach that person to find out.

Cllr Toney reiterated the majority of councillors had voted in favour of accepting the gift of the boardwalk. It might have helped if Mr M had raised these concerns at a full council meeting before the decision was taken.

Cllr McElroy thanked Mr M and said the committee would be discussing matters pertinent to the community boardwalk later in the meeting.

(Mr M left the meeting at this point.)

The following report had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

Warren Recreation Ground – East Preston Cricket Club fundraising

Committee is asked to consider a suggestion from East Preston Cricket Club the Warren Recreation Ground charity nominally leads on fundraising related to improvements to safety measures around the ground.

Councillors will be aware of concerns raised by the Warren Recreation Ground Safety Group and legal correspondence council has had with the group's solicitor. Following the council-funded mediation exercise between the club, the group and the council, the club commissioned a Cricket Ball Strike Assessment report which has suggested 51m of 16m high netting and 12m of 14m high netting for the western boundary, 64m of 16m high and 19m of 11m high on the eastern boundary, and 88m of 3m high netting along the southern boundary. The club is seeking costings for this work and it is likely to exceed £100,000. The club does not have large reserves, £10,000 was mentioned during the mediation exercise.

The club is not a charity. The Warren Recreation Ground is a charity. As such, for every £1 donated with Gift Aid, the charity can claim an extra 25%. Gift Aid is available to charities and community amateur sports clubs (CASCs). The club is already a CASC.

The club has also said improvements to the safety measures would benefit the community beyond just the club itself, another justification for the charity nominally leading on the fundraising campaign.

I see the key word as nominally as I do think neither the charity nor the council should lead on the fundraising, support in whatever ways it can, yes, but not lead.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

7th May 2026

Cllr McElroy questioned why the cricket club wanted the WRG charity to be the nominal lead for fundraising when, as a CASC, the club itself could claim Gift Aid. Peter replied it had been his misunderstanding and he had simply been looking for the most efficient way for the fundraising effort. He now understood as a CASC the club could claim Gift Aid and the club was therefore happy to lead on this. The club's first action would be to set up a community fundraising team, open to anyone. The club was also getting fundraising advice from the Sussex Cricket League and from Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester.

Andy asked the council to ascertain whether, when the time comes, it could purchase the netting and gift it to the club, as the council could claim back the VAT which the club could not do. The committee AGREED unanimously it would look at this and its implications. All present AGREED the council should not be put into a compromising position.

348/26 **SECTION 137 GRANT AID 2026/27 – EAST PRESTON CRICKET CLUB**

The following report had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

Warren Recreation Ground – East Preston Cricket Club netting repairs

Committee is asked to consider a request to help fund netting repairs for the current season.

Each year, the club undertakes essential netting repairs before the season begins. This season's works have been carried out at a cost of £3,690.50 excluding VAT. The club is

asking for £2,000 financial assistance towards this expenditure. Although arguably not a Grant Aid request in the same way as those in Agenda Item 8 above, I have had the club complete a form and provide accounts. These are in the Grant Aid folder available in the office.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

7th May 2026

The committee AGREED unanimously to donate the requested £2,000 to the cricket club. Pete and Andy expressed their thanks to the council. This money would be taken from the council's Section 137 Grant Aid budget for the current financial year.

349/26 WARREN RECREATION GROUND – EAST PRESTON CRICKET CLUB OTHER MATTERS

Andy asked the council to consider its position on the club's additional use of the ground for events that would not use a hard cricket ball. He listed examples such as walking cricket, maybe once a season, and a junior cricket tournament to help with fundraising.

Cllr McElroy suggested the club collated evidence the ball being used for the above events was accepted as not being capable of property or personal damage and once that evidence was collated, the club should inform neighbours of the events being booked.

(Messrs Dallimore and Reeves left the meeting at this point.)

350/26 BANKING

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

Banking – Charity Bank bond maturity

Committee is asked to agree to note the maturity of the council's Ethical Fixed Term Account with The Charity Bank Limited.

This bond was originally for three years and the council invested £80,000 within it. The council received notice on 30th April the bond was due to mature and asking us to let the bank know our preferred option by 18th May.

As Cllr Gunston is currently working closest with Adrian on managing the council's finances, we asked him for his preference. His suggestion would be to reinvest for a further year. Adrian and I agree we reinvest the original £80,000 for a year, but bring the interest to date back into the council's accessible reserves.

Cllr Gunston believes the council can keep a tight rein on expenditure on 118-120 Sea Road this year whilst still aiming for some income, see Agenda Item 17 below.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

7th May 2026

The committee AGREED to reinvest the initial investment for a further year whilst bringing the interest of around £6,000 back into the council's reserves.

There was some confusion over whether any of the council's reserves were protected by the Financial Services Compensation Scheme now the council's budget for the current financial year had increased about £500,000. The Clerk reported because of the budget being above that threshold, the council's reserves were not covered by the Financial Services Compensation Scheme. This was an injustice he had raised to Dr Beccy Cooper MP when she had met councillors in April. The council's protection was to have spread its money across financial institutions. The Clerk and Cllr Gunston agreed the situation was only for the current financial year as they both believed the council's budget would drop again next year.

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

Grant Aid 2026/27

Committee is asked to consider the following Grant Aid requests for the current financial year.

Publicity about the Grant Aid process started in February, with a closing date for applications of 31st March. The following thirteen applications have been received.

Organisation – charity no	Amount requested? (£)	Outcome
1 st East Preston Scout Group * 305895	£600 “Equipment for camping and replacing old air rifles”	£600
4SIGHT Vision Support 1075447	£510 “So that we can continue supporting anyone in your Parish of East Preston who is blind or partially sighted and needs our help”	£510
Air Ambulance Charity Kent Surrey Sussex 1021367	£500 “Grant is requested as a contribution towards the operating costs of HEMS – helicopters, rapid-response vehicles, medical equipment, fuel, highly-trained crews”	£500
Arun Counselling Centre 293053	£300 “to offer a bursary for sessions of confidential, professional counselling/psychological therapy for residents in East Preston”	£300
East Preston in Bloom n/a	£850 “funds to replace seasonal flowers across our borders each season, replace shrubs lost in drought, and purchase plants for new Angmering Station bed, Platform 2”	£850
East Preston Yarnbombers * n/a	£300 “To purchase public liability insurance, wood for a reuseable and general supplies for East Preston Yarnbombers”	£300
Embracing Age 1160400	£750 “We are seeking funds to support the development of our volunteer befriending service within the East Preston parish”	£0
Family Support Work (FSW) 285337	£450 “Funding to provide free Forest School outreach sessions for vulnerable families”	£450
Friends of East Preston Junior School 1203222	£416 “East Preston Junior School are celebrating our 75 th Anniversary. We would like to celebrate and mark the event with a little keepsake for every child”	£416
Friends of Oak Grove College	£812.48 “A life skills learning hub for the pupils of Oak Grove College”	£500

Friends of St Mary's Church 1180544	£400 "... to purchase replacement tree stands for the Bi Annual Christmas Tree Festival at St Mary's Church, East Preston"	£200
Home-Start Arun, Worthing and Adur 1132416	£1,500 "It will enable us to recruit, train and retain volunteers to give vital help to local vulnerable families"	£750
The Stables at Cissbury	£1,000 "changing lives through horses programme"	£0
WADARS 1149884	£1,000 "an unrestricted contribution towards our essential and operational costs involved in rehoming companion animals and rescuing, rehabilitation and release of vulnerable wildlife across West Sussex (including East Preston and surrounds)"	£1,000

The council budgeted **£10,000** for Section 137 Grant Aid donations this financial year.

The total value of the above requests is **£9,388.48**. Maybe I am just being a bit grumpy, but it feels like individual applications are requesting ever-larger sums, which I understand but it's still rankling today.

As before, committee members are advised to call in at the Council Office in advance of the meeting to read the application forms for themselves.

Councillors may wish to think about a maximum sum we award the above organisations or even an annual maximum sum (for example, from £10,000 we could award 20 grants of £500).

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

6th May 2026

N.B. when circulated the Outcome column detailed additional information available electronically.

There was some discussion about whether or not the council should be funding the Scout Group's purchase of air rifles. Cllr Toney was able to explain the air rifles were only ever used indoors, in strictly controlled conditions. Committee members were reassured by this.

The committee was not comfortable donating to such a new and unknown organisation as Embracing Age. The committee AGREED unanimously not to donate this year but to invite the organiser to present to a future council meeting and also to apply again next year.

On behalf of Cllr Linton, the Clerk had ascertained the Friends of East Preston Junior School agreed the council's logo could also be included on the bookmarks and the council could help with handing out the bookmarks.

The committee AGREED unanimously not to donate to The Stables at Cissbury this year as the application did not provide sufficient evidence most than one child was benefitting.

The donations totalled £6,376.00, leaving £3,624.00 in the Section 137 budget line for 2026/27. Taking into account the £2,000 granted to East Preston Cricket Club in Minute 344/26 above, the sum left in the Section 137 budget line for 2026/27 is £1,624.

* Cllrs Toney and Gunston each declared a Personal Interest in one of these two applications, as detailed in Minute 346/26 above, and did not vote on the appropriate one.

352/26 **SECTION 144 GRANT – EAST PRESTON FESTIVAL COMMITTEE**

The following report had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

Section 144 Grant Aid – East Preston Festival Committee

Committee is asked to consider the following tourism grant request for the current financial year.

Organisation – CIC no	Amount requested? (£)	Councillor notes:
East Preston Festival Committee 16126792	£2,140 No one-line summary on the form but it's for insurance and for children's entertainment at the Community Fête.	

The council budgeted £2,500 for Section 144 tourism grants this financial year. This budget line is specifically for East Preston Festival Committee grants.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

7th May 2026

The committee AGREED unanimously to award the full £2,140 to the Festival Committee.

353/26 GRANT AID – THREE-YEAR GRANTS

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

Grant Aid – three-year grants

Committee is asked to consider further the idea of three-year grants.

At the committee's last meeting, the committee agreed unanimously to the concept of awarding three-year grants to certain organisations and to give this further consideration at the committee's next meeting (Minute 125/26). The committee may wish to look at the list of applicants this year and suggest which might be suitable for a three-year grant. Controversial as it might be, perhaps it could be as simple as charity registration and proof the last five year annual returns have been submitted on time – information readily available on the Charity Commission website.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

7th May 2026

The committee AGREED three-year grants were likely a good idea for “big hitters” but would not be appropriate for smaller organisations that maybe only applied for a grant once every few years. The Clerk said he could provide a spreadsheet detailing the money donated to different organisations over the past several years. Money would still only be paid once a year, so if an organisation folded suddenly, there would be no loss to the council.

354/26 EAST PRESTON COMMUNITY BOARDWALK

The following report had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

East Preston Community Boardwalk

Committee is asked to consider the logistics of the take-on of the boardwalk, its attendant benches and any money left with Sea Road Beach Access Ltd..

At the council meeting on 13th April, the council “to accept the offer from Sea Road Beach Access Ltd. to donate the East Preston Community Boardwalk to the council” (Minute 243/26, Resolution 2094).

On the morning after the meeting, I contacted the directors of Sea Road Beach Access Ltd. and said we needed to think about timescales. I asked when the current insurance policy was due to expire, and the answer was 1st September. It is on a monthly direct debit, payable on the 1st of the month; the policy can be cancelled at any time with no cancellation fee. Additionally, the company is paying a monthly bank fee of £6.50.

To be safe and with the knowledge gained from 118-120 Sea Road, it would be wise to set aside a month for the boardwalk to be covered by the council’s insurance. As previously stated we have been advised no safety report is needed for the boardwalk to be covered by insurance.

Following the meeting, Roy Allen emailed, on behalf of his wife, to donate to the council the boardwalk bench he bought for her, and a couple of days later, the chairman of the Disability Action Group (DAG) of East Preston emailed in to donate the council the boardwalk bench it bought. Both of these are made from HDPE, high density polyethylene, the same as the boardwalk itself and, I believe, the council’s benches. Roy added, “The fixings used to assemble the benches may not be A4 stainless steel. If they are not A4 stainless I will replace them (at a convenient time) with A4 stainless fixings at no cost to EPPC or DAG.”

Questions:

Does the council accept the gifts of the benches?

What else does the council want before it officially takes responsibility for the boardwalk?

When would it like to take responsibility for the boardwalk?

A member of the public called me on 30th April stating the council “cannot” take responsibility for the boardwalk, it’s too great a liability. He particularly mentioned the land ownership issue saying if no landowner was found, he could claim the land and ask for the boardwalk to be removed – at great cost to the village. I asked him to put this in writing but to date, he has not done so.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

7th May 2026

Cllr McElroy said he believed Sea Road Beach Access Ltd. should be using some of its reserves to commission a RoSPA risk assessment before it handed over the boardwalk. Although two councillors voted against this, committee AGREED the Clerk should ask this of Sea Road Beach Access Ltd..

The committee would consider its next actions depending upon the response to the above.

The committee AGREED unanimously to adopt the two benches, and these would be covered by any RoSPA risk assessment. The committee also AGREED to incorporate the council’s logo onto the benches and / or the boardwalk.

355/26 LEASES WORKING PARTY: EAST PRESTON & KINGSTON BOWLS CLUB

The following report had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

Leases Working Party – East Preston & Kingston Bowls Club

Committee is asked to receive an update on the renewal of the lease to East Preston & Kingston Bowls Club and to consider a new proposal from the council's negotiator.

On 21st April, I received the following email from Mark Deacon, the surveyor negotiating on behalf of the council:

Hello Simon

Please see below from Julian Wilkins. Whilst I appreciate the greenkeeping aspect at the end of the day we are being as fair as we can and it is under the L&T Act 1954. The land was gifted for the intended use and I can see no evidence of any intention that no charges could be made in the future. They were not custodians otherwise a 60 year lease would not have been granted and indeed if that was the case then a lease of 999 years could have been granted at a peppercorn, which is of course something the PC might want to consider.

Happy to chat through at a time convenient to you.

Thank you

Kind Regards

Mark

Mr Wilkins's email sets out the following:

The proposal to have a second reversionary lease is, in principle, acceptable. However, my clients are understandably still not happy about the proposed future ground rents and reviews.

There is frustration from my client that your clients are looking to obtain a significant rental income from my clients from what is essentially a facility which is a benefit to the community. My clients are well aware that 60 years ago the land was gifted in effect to the parish in order for a bowls club to be formed and that it was never intended that the parish council would be able to charge a significant rental to the bowls club. The land was simply gifted to the parish with the parish council, in effect, being custodians of the land. The situation is further evidenced by the requirement within the lease for the club to make the bowling rink available to non-members. The situation where the bowls club maintains the green, provides the public access and, in effect, provides a community facility is of significant benefit to your clients and to the local community. You are no doubt aware that many other councils maintain bowls rinks themselves and the operation of the bowling greens often is at a loss with revenue generated not covering the costs.

It also appears that there are councils in other parts of the country that accept the onerous maintenance situation on bowls clubs and I have attached information passed to me from the bowls club upon some example leases granted at peppercorn ground rents.

Essentially, my clients would like the council to consider that a lease with a peppercorn rent should be payable or at the very least a low fixed rent without the onerous liability of future significant increases.

My clients have suggested that a way forward would be for representatives of the bowls club and parish council to meet and discuss this face to face. This would allow my clients the opportunity to explain their position and discuss directly with the parish council representatives.

I would be grateful if you could consider the above, discuss with your clients and advise if, on reflection, your clients will agree a nominal fixed ground rent or, if not, whether representatives of the council are prepared to meet and discuss with the bowls club's representatives with a view to finding a way forward which is acceptable to both organisations.

I did reply to Mark and said we had initiated a meeting before with the Bowls Club but the club representatives had not been in a position to negotiate. It was after that both sides got professionals involved.

Where next?

Circulated with the email for this meeting is also a list of agreements made elsewhere in the country recently.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

7th May 2026

After some discussion, the committee AGREED the council's proposal of "£500pa for the first five years, £1,150pa for years 6 to 10, £1,500pa for years 11 to 15. Rent reviews in years 5, 10, 15 and so on, with the reviews for years 5 and 10 pre-set. The reviews could be to OMRV or Index Linked if the latter helps. This was on a 25 year FRI lease." should stand. The committee AGREED it would be prepared to meet with representatives of the Bowls Club.

356/26 INSURANCE VALUATION OF THE COUNCIL'S BUILDINGS

The following report had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

Valuation of the council's property portfolio

Committee is asked to agree the council undertakes an insurance valuation of its property portfolio.

In January, I attended a quarterly meeting of the Sussex branch of the Society of Local Council Clerks, at which Kevin Millard gave a presentation on matters councils should consider when taking on additional assets as part of the local government reorganisation. Kevin works for Arthur J Gallagher, this council's insurance broker. Within the presentation, he made the point councils should regularly be having their property portfolio valued for insurance purposes, the reinstatement value, something this council has not done whilst I have been here. His recommendation was every five years if little has changed. This applies to buildings or structures so would not apply to any of the council's greenspace.

Subsequently, I asked Kevin if he could suggest any companies we could use. He asked Gallagher's in-house Risk Management team to quote for a site visit, £2,450. Kevin then suggested a second company, Cardinus, which responded:

Good afternoon Simon,

I hope you are well.

You asked me to provide a quotation for reinstatement cost assessments (RCAs) for insurance purposes at the following East Preston Parish Council properties:

- **Council Office, 122–124 Sea Road, East Preston, BN16 1NN**
- **Adjacent property, 118–120 Sea Road, East Preston, BN16 1NN**
- **Sea Road toilet block (outside 52 Sea Road), East Preston, BN16 1LP**

We can offer the following options:

Desktop RCA (using digital mapping tools and satellite imagery):

£540 + VAT (£180 + VAT per property)

Full on-site RCA (single report with individual block splits provided):

£865 + VAT

Our quotation is subject to our Standard Terms and Conditions, which can be viewed here:
www.cardinus.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/SaaS%20Terms.pdf

While the properties are suitable for a desktop assessment, we would generally recommend a full on-site RCA for improved accuracy, ensuring any peripheral or less visible elements are properly captured.

If you would like to proceed, please could you confirm in writing and provide the following details:

1. Billing details for invoicing upon completion
2. A point of contact to arrange access (for an on-site visit, if selected)
3. Current declared values for comparison
4. Permission to share completed assessment with AJG
5. Confirmation of how VAT should be applied to the calculations

I trust the above is acceptable, and I look forward to your confirmation.

Kind Regards,

Robert Poole (BA Hons)
Client Relations

As the council has not had a property valuation for several years, I would recommend the site visit option.

As we do not have a specific budget line for this, any decision to proceed would need to be agreed at June's council meeting.

Robert has said he will hold this price until the end of this calendar year.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

7th May 2026

The committee AGREED unanimously to commission the “full on-site RCA” at a cost of £865 excluding VAT.

357/26 118-120 SEA ROAD

The following report had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

118-120 Sea Road

Committee is asked to consider financial implications of the new building and also to consider rental agents.

Cllr Gunston is one of four councillors who have effectively been leading on this project for the past nine months – Cllrs Toney and Linton and Bowman are the other three.

Cllr Gunston will be able to lead any discussion upon financial implications.

Meanwhile, Cllr Gunston has met with representatives of two local rental agencies.

Company 1 said, “I do not feel making huge changes to the flat will give you the viable return. Having marketed various flats in the area I feel the rent would sit around £1295-£1350 with a simple make over.”

Company 2 said, “After meeting with John this morning and taking a look at the split level flat, with the right updates I would suggest you could get circa £1,300.00 / £1,350.00 a month rent.”

Both agents made further comments, and the detail of these can be shared upon request but probably do not need to form part of this supporting paper.

Committee does not need to choose a rental agent yet and could, in fact, ask the Flat & Frontage Working Party to investigate further and make a recommendation.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

8th May 2026

Cllr Gunston advised the lead councillors on this project had agreed not to undertake major alterations to the flat at this time, even if it would result in a better rental price. It was felt the additional return would not justify those alterations at this time.

Cllr Gunston said he wanted to get some volunteers in to help strip out the current décor and do some gardening.

The committee agreed there was no need to have a gas supply to the ground floor space and therefore the current supply could just supply the flat.

Priority for now was to make the flat self-contained and on the market. A decision could not be made on agents as neither had yet provided a management fee. The Clerk would get these.

358/26 COMPUTING SERVICES – DIRECT DEBIT REQUEST

The Clerk reported the council had been approached by its provider of computer server facilities, Flotek (formerly Microshade VSM), to set up a direct debit. As a regular payment, this was broadly in line with §7.9 of the council’s Financial Regulations. The committee AGREED unanimously to this request.

359/26 TERMS OF REFERENCE

The committee was unable to undertake the annual review of its Terms of Reference. This was because the Clerk had noticed a discrepancy between the Terms of Reference for all of the council’s committees and the council’s Standing Orders. He planned to refer this to the council’s Personnel Committee following which he will bring the Terms of Reference back for annual review.

360/26 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16TH FEBRUARY 2026

The draft Minutes had been circulated to all councillors on 18th February asking for suggested amendments by 25th February. None were suggested, but Cllr Wilkinson had commented, “Seems fine to me – thanks.”

The committee AGREED unanimously the Minutes could be signed as a true record of the meeting held on 16th February and Cllr McElroy duly signed the Minutes.

361/26 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The committee NOTED the following report, which had been circulated ahead of the meeting:

Updates from previous meetings

Minute 124/26 – Warren Recreation Ground – Mediation – the facilitator did say to the other parties at the mediation exercise costs were usually split equally, but neither party followed up on this.

Minute 126/26 – earmarked reserves – Adrian has made all the changes as requested.

Minute 127/26 – 118-120 Sea Road – the council’s solicitor duly provided a report which indicated there was no scope for negotiation on the price. The purchase price therefore remained at £430,000.

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**

7th May 2026

Nothing was added.

362/26 ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING (17TH AUGUST)

Nothing was raised.

The Meeting closed at 20.48.

Chairman: **Cllr Rick McElroy**

Date: **17th August 2026**

(END)