



MINUTES of the **EXTRAORDINARY MEETING** of the **TOWN COUNCIL** held virtually on **MONDAY 22 JUNE 2020**

Present: Roger Cartwright Town Mayor
Anne Eves Deputy Town Mayor

Graham Allen
Andrew Barrett-Miles
Emma Coe-Gunnell White*
Matthew Cornish
Peter Chapman
Robert Duggan
Robert Eggleston
Lee Gibbs
Janice Henwood
Simon Hicks
Tofojjul Hussain
Joseph Foster
Sarah Lawrence
Sylvia Neumann
Max Nielsen
Kathleen Willis*

* *Denotes non-attendance.*

(19.00)

Councillor Robert Eggleston proposed to alter the order of business to deal with Agenda Items 1-5 first, then items 10-13, then return to the rest of the agenda. This was seconded by Councillor Joe Foster, and was voted on and agreed.

115. OPEN FORUM

The Council would listen to questions from the public during the Open Forum and would respond during the relevant item.

A member of the public screen-shared a presentation (attached as Appendix 1) and spoke on behalf of the Theobalds Road Residents Association and users of the bridleway. This related to Agenda Item

13 on the Place and Connectivity Project. The member of the public stated that when consulted on the path, people liked the way it was. They stated that it was not suitable for the Burgess Hill to Haywards Heath cycle route as it was long and indirect, not traffic free, and currently went from 'nowhere to nowhere'. The environment would be severely damaged by the development, and it was urbanisation for the sake of urbanisation. The design was for an urban commuter cycleway, suitable for speeds of up to 15mph. The justification from, Mid Sussex District Council was the number of people who travel from Burgess Hill to Haywards Heath for work. The member of the public cited the 2011 census, which showed that 8 people would use the route. Because this data was out of date, they had also looked at the Sports England survey for the department of transport, which showed that this had not changed. Since lockdown they had completed 2 surveys which said that 75% of people wanted better walking and cycling facilities. They said that there hadn't been enough effort put in to find a central route.

The three minutes given for the member of the public to speak ended, but the slides were given as an Appendix to the minutes.

A member of the public representing the South of Folders Lane Action Group (SOFLAG) thanked the Council for standing up for the town. They stated that it was needed, as the Town Centre was being reduced to rubble. In addition to the new homes planned for the Northern Arc development, MSDC were now adding more under the Site Allocation DPD, particularly in the area south of Folders Lane. They commented that Burgess Hill would suffer and there would be thousands of extra car journeys through already gridlocked areas. MSDC had said that with mitigation this would be fine; however this proposed mitigation was just bike racks at the station and the dual carriageway at the other side of town. There was also a proposal for traffic lights at Hoadleys corner. They said that there were errors in the SYSTRA study. They had sent questions to MSDC over a month ago but had no response yet. Decisions had been made by a Working Group set up before the last election, which was legally supposed to have political balance, but it was not reflective of the Council, and Burgess Hill was unrepresented at the final meeting. MSDC had refused a FOI request to see notes from the final meeting, and had also refused another FOI request from SOFLAG.

In response it was commented that the Place and Connectivity Project was not the final transport strategy for Burgess Hill, and this would be addressed later in the year.

A third member of the public spoke on the Sustainable Transport Plan. As a partially sighted user of streets, they had suffered with cyclists on paths, so shared use paths were of particular concern. They wished to draw attention to the Burgess Hill Station section of the plan, particularly the Keymer Parade area. The plans caused concern for the independent shops there who would be boxed in with a wall in front of their doorways. Silvas, a coffee shop on Keymer Parade, had become a bastion of the community, and had become incredibly

popular very quickly. The member of the public was concerned about the impact of these plans on their work. Their customers would be walking straight out onto a cycle path.

A member of the Fat Belly Cycle Club had sent a message to register their support for the proposed cycle lane, part of the Place and Connectivity Project.

116. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence had been received from Councillor Kathleen Willis.

117. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Andrew Barrett-Miles declared an interest in Item 13 as he was a West Sussex County Councillor, and a member of the Members Steering Committee who were responsible for reviewing comments made on this consultation. He would refrain from discussion and voting on this item.

Councillor Robert Eggleston declared an interest in Item 13 as he was also a member of the Members Steering Committee responsible for reviewing comments made on this consultation.

118. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were none.

119. **COUNCIL MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on Monday 16 April 2020 were **AGREED** and signed as a correct record.

Agenda Items 10-13 were then considered, as moved at the beginning of the meeting.

120. **NOTES FROM OPEN MARKET WORKING PARTY**

The Working Party had met four times and had conducted an on-site visit to determine sites for stalls. The Notes were attached to the Agenda as Appendices 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Councillor Matthew Cornish had chaired this Working Group and gave context that they had been working on initiating an Open Market and reviving the Town Centre while the Town waited on the redevelopment. He gave a summary of the recommendations and thanked all those who were involved. He stated that it was important to diversify the shopping aspects for the town and bring in people from outside of the town. It would also bring in areas of entertainment, and a family friendly market environment.

Councillor Anne Eves had visited Lewes Market to speak to the traders and noted that one trader had observed that people felt safer outdoors under the current Covid-19 climate, so now could be a good time to introduce an Open Market.

Councillor Robert Eggleston noted that this was a very important milestone in policy development as a Town Council. During lockdown there had been heavy lifting on revitalising the town centre. He was grateful to members and officers working to bring this off the ground.

It was noted that there had been questions on why the market would only take place one Saturday a month. It was suggested that maybe in the future, once it was proven that it worked, this could be extended. It was noted that this would increase the variety Burgess Hill offered as a town by doing something different to other towns in the district.

It was commented that shopping was changing, and this was an opportunity to acknowledge and embrace that change. It was important for the Town to make an attractive shopping experience.

It was noted that there would be opportunities for specific one-off events with the licence, for example a Christmas Market.

RESOLVED that:

1. The notes of the Open Market Working Group held on 14 May 2020, 21 May 2020, 4 June 2020 and 15 June 2020 were noted and the actions set out were approved.
2. The Burgess Hill Open Market Regulations (Appendix 6 of the Agenda), Application Form (Appendix 7 of the Agenda) and Business Plan (Appendix 8 of the Agenda) were approved including the tariff of £20 for a standard pitch set out therein.
3. The market would be held on the second Saturday of each month from September 2020.

121. NOTES FROM TRADING SPACES WORKING PARTY

Agenda Items 11 and 12 were discussed together as they were both on the Trading Spaces project.

It was commented that this was another area in which Burgess Hill and Burgess Hill Town Council were marking the town out as being a different place and offering a different experience. Councillor Eggleston thanked the Working Party for their input.

Councillor Eggleston noted that he had been doing some work with the organisation Workman, who was managing the Martlets area, considering units and talking to potential tenants. Early on they had identified people who would come in and take space, including a zero-waste store, run by young entrepreneurs, who wanted to give back to the community and with a well-known Burgess Hill Charity which was keen to get involved and bring craft and art workshops and activities to the Town Centre. Including the Open Market, this was three live projects in a tired bit of the shopping area.

It was noted that the Trading Spaces project would be delivered on the basis of proof of concept, with no tie in to onerous leases. If the concept worked, then it could be lifted to a permanent location.

It was noted that there was work to do on the premises, and the Town Council could engage with members of the community to bring the project alive as a community focused project.

It was commented that this was something that everyone at the Town Council could be proud of.

It was suggested that the Town Council should encourage traders to be on board before committing to any substantial expenditure. There should be a guarantee from the anchor tenant that they would be on board before refurbishment was started.

It was responded that nothing would be committed to until the parties were all fully on board.

It was questioned whether the Council should have formalised that they were open to facilitate businesses getting on board, as this would lead to a more even playing field. It might come across that the Council had cherry-picked businesses.

It was responded that if the project was approved, then an announcement could be made.

The Working Party had met twice. The Notes were attached to the Agenda as Appendices 9 and 10. The Notes were considered in conjunction with Agenda Item 12.

122. **TRADING SPACES**

The Trading Spaces Working Party had met on two occasions to explore the concept further (12 May and 3 June), as set out in Agenda Item 12 dated 22 June 2020.

RESOLVED that:

The Council would:

1. Implement the Trading Spaces project by initially taking a lease, via Burgess Hill Community Partnership CIC on Units 25 – 29 The Martlets on a two-year tenancy with a three-month mutual break clause from New River REIT subject to satisfaction with the financial terms and the other terms and conditions of the lease;
2. Establish the first Trading Spaces unit with a clear model based on zero-waste and sustainability;
3. Prepare and enter into leases with sub-tenants on financial terms to be agreed with them (noting that the period of the tenancy and break will be not be more favourable than the tenancy signed by Burgess Hill Community Partnership Plc with New River REIT);
4. Zone and divide the sub-units for 25-29 The Martlets for potential tenants and implement necessary work for this purpose;

5. Confirm and register the appointments of the directors of Burgess Hill Community Partnership CIC for those Councillors and Officers willing to continue to serve;
6. Prepare an operational and financial risk assessment for Trading Spaces (including confirming that appropriate insurances are in place)
7. Prepare a schedule of works in compliance with current building regulations.
8. Continue to work with other interested parties in bringing other units in the Martlets Shopping Centre back into use;
9. Aim for the first Trading Spaces unit to open in September 2020.

123. **PLACE AND CONNECTIVITY PROGRAMME**

Mid Sussex District Council had opened the Place and Connectivity programme for public consultation, as set out in Agenda Item 13 dated Monday 22 June 2020.

It was noted that Councillor Robert Duggan had amended the recommendations, so the recommendations being discussed were altered from the appendices issued with the agenda.

The Councillors would discuss and vote on the recommendations for each project within the Place and Connectivity Programme separately.

Contextual information was given that this was a programme of works to improve transport links, largely funded by Section 106 contributions. Burgess Hill Town Council were not a statutory consultee, but were responding to the consultation issued.

Councillor Andrew Barrett-Miles declared an interest in this item as he was a West Sussex County Councillor, and a member of the Members Steering Committee who were responsible for reviewing comments made on this consultation. He would refrain from discussion and voting on this item.

Councillor Robert Eggleston declared an interest as he was also a member of the Members Steering Committee responsible for reviewing comments made on this consultation.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

It was noted that Councillor Robert Duggan had provided amendments in his document distributed before the meeting.

Councillor Duggan commented that the feasibility studies and assessments for these projects weighed them on the basis of complexity and the benefit of the projects, but did not factor in safety. This was an omission throughout the projects.

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations with the amendments provided by Councillor Duggan were voted on and agreed as follows:

Summary General Recommendations: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) Where possible use the Sussex Way stepped down model to segregate pedestrians and cyclists and only default to dual use when not possible as per WSCC's Cycling Design Guide.
- b) Raised tables at junctions with side roads should prioritise pedestrians and cyclists to avoid confusion over who has right of way.
- c) Combine the delivery of the cycle way projects in conjunction with the Town wide Cycling and Walking Strategy (May 2020) which is being delivered as part of the Northern Arc Masterplan.
- d) Incorporate 20mph speed limits and other traffic calming measures in those areas of contention between motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.
- e) Consider creating safer routes to schools as a higher priority.

PROJECT 1 – BURGESS HILL TO HAYWARDS HEATH GREENWAYS

It was noted that Councillor Robert Duggan had provided amendments in his document distributed before the meeting.

The Council were grateful for the work that the Theobalds Road Residents Association did, and their presentation during the Open Forum would be taken into account.

It was discussed whether the Residents Association's comments should be included with the Council's recommendations, as it was a particular interest group. It was noted that they could respond to the consultation as an independent body, and Burgess Hill Town Council was responding as a corporate body. In response it was commented that the Association had presented valid reasons as to why further investigation was needed. As residents of the Way they had an understanding of it. It would provide meat to the case for asking planners to look at an alternative given that the Eastern and Western Routes both had problems.

It was suggested that the Council should list the routes in order of preference, with Theobald's Road being the least preferable route. A third option near Rocky Lane was the preferred option. People did currently walk and cycle along this route as it was the most direct.

It was commented that there was one objection to the Western Route which went through the Heaselands Estate, whereas the whole road were objecting to the Eastern Route through Theobalds Road.

It was commented that the Western Route through the Heaselands Estate was the most direct route suggested but may not be deliverable within the timescale. Compulsory purchase of the land could be a long and costly process.

The concerns raised by the Theobalds Road Residents Association about the environmental impact of the route and the urbanisation of the area were noted.

It was commented that it was clear in the recommendation that the Eastern greenway was the worst option, planners should look at a third way and seek to persuade the owner of the Heaselands Estate to allow access through their land.

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations with the amendments provided by Councillor Duggan were voted on and agreed as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) The Town Council supports a greenway route between Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath and recognises there are legal issues with both western and eastern routes so would like to request before any commitment is made by the consultants/planners that consideration is given to a third option near Rocky Lane as an alternative route between the two towns.

PROJECT 2: WIVELSFIELD RAILWAY STATION AREA

It was noted that Councillor Robert Duggan had provided amendments in his document distributed before the meeting.

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations with the amendments provided by Councillor Duggan were voted on and agreed as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) The Town Council welcomes the proposed improvements at Wivelsfield Railway Station
- b) Council feels there is a lack of clarity in the plan regarding a car park on the north side off Leylands Road, west of railway line, and that there are further opportunities to explore.
- c) Provision of pedestrian crossing across Junction Road from St Wilfrids Bridge to Cants Lane should be brought forward as part of this project (Route 16 in the Feasibility Report).
- d) There should be access to railway platform from proposed new path between St Wilfrid's Road to Leylands Road
- e) Discourage drop off/pick up point in Gordon Road/Gladstone Road area.

PROJECT 3: BURGESS HILL RAILWAY STATION AREA.

It was noted that Councillor Robert Duggan had provided amendments in his document distributed before the meeting.

It was questioned whether the Council were happy with expressing concern about the 2-way cycling around Station Road and Keymer Parade – should this be a formal objection?

It was noted that the representative from SOFLAG had brought up traffic lights during the Open Forum. There was not currently a proposal for traffic lights, there was a proposal for a Toucan Crossing in front of the school. During the Working Group meetings alternatives were discussed with differing opinions.

The point made by the resident during the Open Forum regarding the Keymer Parade shops would be picked up.

Councillor Duggan explained that he had re-organised the points so that each one made a separate and distinct point.

It was suggested that the recommendation asked for traffic lights to be considered, and that the planners could make their own decision about what would be best, taking into account safety and potential for pollution.

It was noted that there was concern for the businesses on Keymer Parade, over the wall obscuring the businesses. It was questioned whether the Council knew for a fact that there would be a wall? Nathan Spilsted had been contacted and would be pressing for diagrams to be provided.

Regarding the proposal for Keymer Parade, it was commented that there were problems with the proposed scheme, and problems with having the cycleway on the carriageway. There were many hazards on and off the road in this area, they must do as much as possible to mitigate this but it may never be perfect.

In the proposal for Keymer Parade it was noted that it was segregated, with the bottom path for pedestrians, and the top path for cyclists. In some places the 4m wide top path was close to verge, in some it was not. The retaining wall would be a similar height to what it is currently, at the mid-point the wall would come in 2m, but would stay the same height as it was currently. It would have to be ensured that this wasn't just a solution to suit a cyclist or pedestrian, but also took into account those who live and trade there.

It was commented that the Council should bear in mind that there was a parking bay at the higher level, so people would still have to walk through the cycle area if they were getting out of parked cars.

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations with the amendments provided by Councillor Duggan were voted on and agreed as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) The sandstone retaining wall between Keymer Court and access road to railway car park needs to be repaired, not a good first impression to Burgess Hill.
- b) Review the cycle lane provision from Hoadleys Corner Roundabout (Keymer Road) through to Civic Way Roundabout (McDonalds) as the current proposals contain a number of potential hazards for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.
- c) Keymer Parade, concerned that delivery vehicles and cars will mount pavement if layby is narrowed (also at layby in Station Road, nos 33-49), and detriment to shops if the steps are removed between the two levels. Careful consideration needed for the aesthetic lay-out if the retaining wall is raised as a result of pavement widening.
- d) Object to a shared 2-way cycle path/footway passing in front of Burgess Hill Station. There are clear risks to people leaving and entering the station from cyclists coming down the hill. The amount of space allowed for the taxi rank is inadequate, leading to risks to cyclists from taxi drivers opening their doors. The risks are increased at the pinch point where the pavement narrows to 2.4 metres and is further impeded by the Pelican crossing.
- e) Concerned about 2-way cycling across shop fronts between Wolstonbury Way and Queens Crescent. Also need to consider pinch point at Queens Crescent where the pavement narrows significantly.
- f) Table crossings at side roads (Wolstonbury Way, Queens Crescent and Station Road where it branches) are welcome for the improved safety offered to pedestrians and cyclists. However the junctions may be regularly blocked and the priority for pedestrians, cyclists or motorists needs to be satisfactorily resolved. Corner radii need to be reduced to reduce speeds.
- g) The 2-way cycle lanes create safety problems at the entry and exit points at Civic Way and Hoadleys Corner roundabouts where cyclists must cross the road. Consider alternative of traffic lights at these junctions.
- h) Given the issues noted in b) to g) above, consider withdrawing the proposed shared pavements throughout Project 3 and replace with on-carriageway cycle lanes, particularly on the north side of Station Road in the eastbound (uphill) direction as a minimum.
- i) Retain as much as possible of the proposed pavement widening which is of benefit to the street ambience and allows for the provision of cycle parking and seating at the bus stop and the station.

PROJECT 4 – CHURCH ROAD AND CHURCH WALK

It was noted that there were already issues with the tree planters in Haywards Heath. It was commented that there should only be shrubs

or bushes in planters, trees should be planted in the ground. It was suggested that a horticulturist could be used to say what would be suitable for planters.

Councillor Janice Henwood proposed that recommendation 'b' be amended to read as follows:

- b) The Town Council has the opportunity to choose the design of planters for plants. As a standard policy, trees should be planted into the ground rather than planters.

This amendment proposal was seconded by Councillor Anne Eves. This amendment was voted on and agreed.

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations with the amendment as above, proposed by Councillor Henwood, were voted on and agreed as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) Support locating trees and plants in Church Walk and Church Road, though request use different species of trees as Lime trees produce sticky sap and Crab Apple trees drop their fruit and causes trip and slip hazards to pedestrians.
- b) the Town Council has the opportunity to choose the design of planters for plants. As a standard policy, trees should be planted into the ground rather than planters.
- c) A raised table crossing is needed across Crescent Road from Church Walk to St John's Church and also at junction across St John's Road by St John's Church to St John's Park.
- d) Formalise the entrance into St John's Park from St John's Road.
- e) Do not support the idea of an amphitheatre.
- f) Agree to removal of existing Stone Garden. A flexible open space could be framed in some way to include Memorial Garden and extend the planter by the Post Office to complement an extension to the Memorial Garden and make a more attractive welcoming entrance into the town centre.
- g) Have a ground level water feature at the bottom of Church Walk which can be turned off for events.
- h) Request the street lighting is redesigned from Bandstand down to the Town Council offices so there is a clearer area for event staging.
- i) Seating/planting next to Theatre Club is disconnected from main Memorial Garden, suggest plants thinned out and add more seats. Retain all roses but transplant as part of an enlargement of the Memorial Garden.
- j) War Memorial low brick wall by Crescent Road/Way uninteresting and entrance is facing away from town centre so not inclusive. Would like entrance facing the town centre, make Memorial Garden bigger by bringing it out into Church Walk/next to Theatre Club, but still have it as an area set apart/tranquil contemplation, plus additional seating. The War Memorial Trust need to be consulted

- on proposed works.
- k) Review location of bike storage area so that the risk of opportunistic theft is reduced to a minimum.
 - l) Retain the Bandstand and 'Choochy-train' seat.
 - m) Seating and tree protection should be produced from sustainable materials (e.g. sustainable hardwood or recycled materials).

Project 5 – Town Centre Western gateway

It was noted that Councillor Robert Duggan had provided amendments in his document distributed before the meeting.

Context was provided that the idea for a bus lane was put forward by the bus companies, who had no objection to it also being used for a cycle lane. The space in the central reservation could be given over the bus and cycle lane, which would take off pressure on the south side of the road.

It was commented that combining the bus and cycle lane could put off cyclists. Although experienced cyclists may not be bothered, new cyclists may be put off. The example was raised that in Brighton the experience of cycling with the buses was not brilliant.

It was commented that changing from a roundabout to traffic lights on the McDonalds roundabout could enhance safety. Cars were sometimes trapped on the roundabout, putting them in danger. The solution would not help McDonalds but could help in terms of safety.

In response to this, it was commented that this could still be an issue with traffic lights. It was not for the Town Council to paint a solution, but to raise that this was a problem that needed to be sorted.

It was commented that Councillor Duggan's addition that 'there is no evidence offered' was a good point. No-one at the Town Council knew whether the roundabout or traffic light solution was best, they just wanted to see the evidence.

It was commented that the congestion was mainly passenger vehicles so the combined bus and cycle lane may not do much to resolve this.

A separate vote was taken on whether the Council were in favour of a combined bus and cycle lane. It was agreed that the Council were in favour of a combined bus and cycle lane.

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations with the amendments provided by Councillor Duggan were voted on and agreed as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) There is no evidence offered that the 4-way traffic lights at the Station Road/Queen Elizabeth Avenue/Civic Way (McDonalds) roundabout will resolve the issue of traffic backing up and blocking access to McDonalds drive-thru. Suggest a 2 lane solution is created off Station Road using part of MSDC car park as part of any plan.
- b) Take into consideration Metrobus' comments to add a combined Bus and Cycle lane in the Eastbound direction and revisit proposals for Queen Elizabeth Avenue and McDonald's roundabout to prioritise bus and cycle usage.

PROJECT 6 – VICTORIA BUSINESS PARK

It was noted that Councillor Robert Duggan had provided amendments in his document distributed before the meeting.

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations with the amendments provided by Councillor Duggan were voted on and agreed as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) The proposals for Victoria Business Park need to be reconsidered with the alternative of selective on-carriageway cycling provision.
- b) The proposal underestimates the level of street parking in the area and capacity required and the plan is not practical on this point.
- c) Safe route for cyclists is around the Green Circle path network with entry/exit points into Victoria Business Park.
- d) Propose 'no access to lorries' in Victoria Avenue to Victoria Business Park from Royal George Road and make Victoria Avenue/Road into a cul-de-sac with a new link road built across from Victoria Road to York Road.
- e) Request funds from this project are used for traffic lights at Mill Road/Leylands Road
- f) Support the proposal to change the existing steps by Burnside to a ramp to make it accessible to all as it is a well-used route.

PROJECT 7 – TOWN WIDE GREEN LINKS (PHASE 1)

It was noted that Councillor Robert Duggan had provided amendments in his document distributed before the meeting. He had identified a number of routes in Phase 2 which could be brought into Phase 1. It was commented that in the prioritisation, the top 10 were those which were cheapest to do, not necessarily those which increased safety or improved routes for schools. Examples had been added to the recommendations to make it more specific on things which could have been considered.

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations with the amendments provided by Councillor Duggan were voted on and agreed as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) The Town Council welcomes the proposed improvements to the Townwide Green Links, however requests the phasing of the projects is revisited to provide better connectivity across the town and to bring forward some of the Phase 2 schemes into Phase 1, for example:
- No. 11 Kings Way to Manor Road – improves the bridleway 10BH
 - No 15 Mill Road/Leylands Road + traffic lights
 - No. 16 St Wilfrids Bridge to Junction Road new path and crossing
 - No. 17 Manor Road link up east side (Unicorn) housing to Wivelsfield Railway Station
 - No 21 Fairfield Recreation Ground to Royal George Road path as a route to Southway School
 - No 22 pedestrian priority to Southway School
 - No. 23 London Road – improvements to make it safe for pedestrians
 - No. 25 Chanctonbury Road – traffic calming to reduce rat run
 - No 26 – open up the existing gate between Wykeham Way to The Holt to make it a shared route
- b) The Pegasus equestrian crossing across A273 London Road is supported.

PROJECT 8 - TRIANGLE LEISURE CENTRE

RESOLVED that:

the recommendations were approved as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) the Town Council supports the plans for this project.

PROJECT 9 - BUS INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT (BUS STOPS/RTPIS)

It was noted that Councillor Robert Duggan had provided amendments in his document distributed before the meeting.

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations with the amendments provided by Councillor Duggan were voted on and agreed as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) The Town Council welcomes improved passenger waiting facilities and provision of additional Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI)

screens.

- b) Be noted the 'Wish List' put forward by the Town Council for new bus shelters will affect the type of RTPI screen installed.
- c) Take into consideration Metrobus' comments suggesting a bus and cycle lane and revisit proposals for Queen Elizabeth Avenue and McDonald's roundabout.

PROJECT 10 – CYCLE PARKING (PHASE 1)

RESOLVED that:

The recommendations were approved as follows:

Summary Recommendation: The following comments be made to Mid Sussex District Council:

- a) The Town Council supports additional cycle parking in Burgess Hill however the consultation provides limited information such as the type and design of cycle parking.
- b) The Town Council would also ask the following locations are added to Phase 1:
 - Co-op, Junction Road
 - Co-op, Maple Drive
 - Co-op, Kings Way
 - Tesco Express, Gatehouse Lane
- c) The Town Council prefers covered cycle parking but request they are well lit and CCTV to reduce anti-social behaviour.

124. PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Councillor Henwood, Chair of the Planning Committee presented the minutes from the meetings held on Monday 27 April 2020, Monday 18 May 2020 and Monday 8 June 2020. She noted that the Committee had consulted on road naming for the Northern Arc development, and had submitted list of names, and an alternative name for a section of the Spine Road, which had been adopted. She thanked Heather Warne, local historian, and Councillor Sylvia Neumann for their input on this.

The Minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on Monday 27 April 2020, Monday 18 May 2020 and Monday 8 June 2020 were **AGREED**.

125. CUSTOMER SERVICES KEY AREA GROUP – NOTES OF MEETING

Councillor Robert Duggan, Chair of the Customer Services Key Area Group, presented the minutes from their meeting on Tuesday 28 April. There were no further updates on any of the items.

Councillor Robert Eggleston raised that with social distancing it was currently unclear what would happen with the sandpit, and a decision may have to be made at late notice. He proposed that the decision be delegated to himself, as Leader of the Council, Councillor Robert

Duggan as Chair of the Customer Services KAG, and Councillors Peter Chapman, Anne Eves and Andrew Barrett-Miles as leaders of their respective parties. If the Leader of the Council or Chair of the KAG were incapacitated, the decision should be made by the Deputy Leader or Vice Chair.

This was voted on and agreed that the decision would be delegated.

The Notes of the Meeting of the Customer Services Key Area Group held on Tuesday 28 April 2020 were **AGREED**.

126. **STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT KEY AREA GROUP: NOTES OF MEETING**

Councillor Robert Eggleston raised that with social distancing it was currently unclear what would happen with the Outdoor Cinema and Drive-In Cinema. He proposed that the decision be delegated to himself, as Leader of the Council, the Chair of the relevant KAG, and Councillors Peter Chapman, Anne Eves and Andrew Barrett-Miles as leaders of their respective parties. If the Leader of the Council or Chair of the KAG were incapacitated, the decision should be made by the Deputy Leader or Vice Chair.

This was voted on and agreed that the decision would be delegated.

The Notes of the Meeting of the Strategic Development Key Area Group held on Wednesday 29 April 2020 were **AGREED**.

Various working parties were set up at the meeting of the Strategic Key Area Group. The following items were reports and recommendations from these working parties.

127. **NOTES FROM THE COMMUNITY ASSETS WORKING PARTY**

The Working Party held one meeting on 13 May 2020. The Notes were attached to the Agenda as Appendix 1. Following a later meeting with the Theatre Club the group agreed to withdraw the application for the Little Theatre.

RESOLVED that:

1. The notes of the Community Assets Working Party held on 13 May 2020 were Noted and Agreed.
2. It was noted that applications for Asset of Community Value status had been submitted for the following buildings:
 - Orion Theatre
 - Burnside
 - New Library
 - Little Theatre, Church Walk (withdrawn)
 - St John's Cricket Pavilion

128. **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT KEY AREA GROUP: NOTES OF MEETING**

Councillor Joe Foster had chaired this meeting on behalf of Councillor Kathleen Willis. He thanked all councillors who were a part of this meeting.

Councillor Robert Eggleston clarified that his previous proposal on a delegated decision for the Outdoor Cinema and Drive-In Cinema had related to this item, rather than Item 8, as it came under the remit of the Community Engagement KAG.

The Notes of the Meeting of the Community Engagement Key Area Group held on Monday 15 June 2020 were **AGREED**.

129. **MOTION TO COUNCIL: AIR POLLUTION**

A motion was submitted to the Council by Councillor Anne Eves and seconded by Councillor Sylvia Neumann, as set out in Agenda Item 15 dated 22 June 2020.

RESOLVED that:

The motion was approved as below:

“BHTC requests to see the past year's monthly air pollution figures from the town's sensors, when these become available to MSDC. This Council notes that the two air pollution monitoring stations in town are both in Leylands Ward on the north side of town (London Rd & Leylands Rd). The Council supports the addition of a third monitoring station, further south, and suggests to MSDC that the bed showroom, BigBrandBeds, at Hoadley's Corner would be an appropriate place, subject to their agreement.”

130. **COVID-19 BENCH**

A member of public suggested that a bench should be designed and installed to commemorate Covid-19 and the effects it has had on the community, as set out in Agenda Item 16 dated 22 June 2020.

It was commented that Burgess Hill Town Council could never thank the Town's Key Workers enough for their dedication and heroism, and that the crisis was not yet over.

Councillor Robert Eggleston proposed that the Council just accept recommendation 1, that a bench would be purchased, and later to have a poll of members so that all could have an input on the design, wording and location of the bench. An appropriate time could then be chosen to install it.

A discussion ensued, where there following points were raised:

- Was it premature to plan a memorial while the crisis was still ongoing? Was it too early to say what the Council would want as a permanent memorial?
- Should members of the public have input on the design, similarly to the bench on the junction of Queen Elizabeth Avenue? It was noted that the idea for the bench had come from a member of the public.
- There were issues with inviting designs from the public, and CEO Steve Cridland recommended against this. As an alternative, 3 designs could be put to a public vote.
- The efforts of the community and key workers should be recognised, this was a chance to do something tangible as a sign of recognition.
- The Council could agree to commemorate the community at this meeting, and plan details at a later stage.
- The purpose of the bench was to recognise current efforts from the community and Key workers.
- The bench could be done now, and there was nothing stopping any members from coming forward in the future to suggest a more substantial memorial.
- Everyone in the community should be recognised, not solely Key Workers.
- A bench was a traditional way of recognising the service that all in the community had given.

Councillor Janice Henwood proposed the following amendment to the resolution, which was seconded by Councillor Anne Eves:

Burgess Hill Town Council recognises the contribution our community has made during this pandemic. Details should be referred to our Customer Services Key Area Group.

This amendment was voted on and was not passed.

There was a vote on just approving recommendation 1, that a bench would be purchased, and later to have a poll of members so that all could have an input on the design, wording and location of the bench and the timing of its installation. This was voted on and agreed.

RESOLVED that:

1. A commemorative bench would be purchased and installed from David Ogilvie at a cost of approximately £2500 to recognise/commemorate the effects upon the Burgess Hill Community as a result of Covid-19.

131. COMMITTEE RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

Councillor Joseph Foster had resigned from the Community Engagement KAG and Councillor Simon Hicks had resigned from the Customer Services KAG. Councillor Foster had been appointed to the Customer Services KAG and Councillor Hicks had been appointed to the Community Engagement KAG.

RESOLVED that:

The resignations and appointments were noted.

132. Meeting terminated at 21.12 hours.