

MAYFIELD AND FIVE ASHES PARISH COUNCIL

8C01

FINAL

R FITZSIMMONS,
CHAIRMAN

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MAYFIELD
AND FIVE ASHES PARISH COUNCIL**

**HELD AT MAYFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL
ON MONDAY 14 APRIL 2008 AT 1930 HOURS**

**Chairman Of Mayfield And Five Ashes Parish Council
Councillor Martin Pitcher
Meeting Chairman Councillor Robert Fitzsimmons**

SUMMARY OF MEETING

- Presentation by ESCC on gypsy and traveller issues.
- Wincanton Site Planning Application for housing and commercial units discussed.
- Provisional Year End results.
- Additional provision of land to Mayfield Pre-School approved.
- Argos Hill Windmill discussed.
- Newick Lane traffic calming discussed.
- Mayfield Community Hall progress discussed.

ATTENDANCE

Martin Pitcher	(MP)	Apologies for Absence (B)
Paul Amans	(PA)	Present and Voting
Peter Deller	(PD)	Present and Voting
Jane Driscoll	(JD)	Present and Voting
Elaine Wheeler	(EW)	Present and Voting
Patricia Balfour	(PB)	Present and Voting
Jayne Bramwell	(JB)	Apologies for Absence (H)
Graham Playfoot	(GP)	Present and Voting
Hubert Hills	(HH)	Present and Voting
Deveda Redman	(DR)	Present and Voting
Catherine Swingland	(CS)	Apologies for Absence (B)
Robert Fitzsimmons	(RF)	Present and Voting
Chris Lilly	(CL)	Present and Voting
Jerry Watkiss	(JW)	Present and Voting
Tony Lay	(TL)	Present and Voting

Present and voting 12

Present and not voting 0

Apologies for Absence 3

Not present 0

Other Council Business 0

Also Present

ESCC Councillors Robert Tidy (RT), Wealden District Councillors B Redman (BR), G Wells (GH)
David Thompson Parish Clerk (DT)

Apologies for Absence

(WDC) Robert Standley, Jonica Fox (JF), (ESCC) Chris Dowling (CD)

There were four members of the public present.

MINUTES

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS ON AGENDA ITEMS BELOW

- 1.1. GP declared a personal interest as Chairman of the Five Ashes Village Hall Committee.
- 1.2. TL declared a personal interest on agenda item 23 as a local resident.
- 1.3. PB declared a personal interest on agenda item 23 as a local resident.
- 1.4. There were no other declarations of interest.

2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 2.1. The Chairman reported that the School Hall alarm was faulty and the engineer had been informed.
- 2.2. The Chairman welcomed Ms Trudy McGuigan and Mr Graham Furness from East Sussex County Council.
- 2.3. The Chairman reminded members of the Quality Council Presentation on Wednesday 16 April 2008.
 - Start 20.00 hrs
 - Presentation 20.30 hrs

3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

- 3.1. Lloyd McLean reported an accident on the A267 between Five Ashes Road at Argos Hill Junction.
- 3.2. IB reported that the bus shelter at Southmead Close had been damaged.

ACTION DT

4. GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

- 4.1. Ms Trudy McGuigan of ESCC gave a presentation on the problems of gypsies and travellers with the county.
 - In East Sussex the gypsy and traveller population was of largely Romany stock and had been in the county for well over 100 years.
 - The majority caused no problems.
 - There was a national requirement to provide adequate sites for settlement.
 - Currently there were four permanent sites and one transit site. The four sites do not meet needs.
 - There had been cases where gypsies were buying land on which to settle. These actions usually provoked public objection but were often won on appeal, because purpose built sites were not available. Gypsies did not like brick dwellings.
 - ESCC had a duty to assess needs. This had been carried out in November 2005 and resulted in an assessment of 47 pitches.
 - ESCC had a gypsy/traveller strategy and associated action plan. Reports were made on a regular basis and meetings were held at least quarterly.
 - There was a traveller forum which was designed to inform travellers of policy issues.
 - The lack of sites meant that alternative accommodation had to be found.

- When gypsies bought land on which to settle it was difficult to refuse planning when other sites were not available.
 - Gypsies now had access to specialist legal advice.
 - Wealden had 75% of the County gypsy and traveller population.
 - Graham Furness would cover highway issues and Ms McGuigan would cover general questions.
 - The presentation concluded.
- 4.2. PA wished to know where the gypsies had come from?
- Answer – not much was known about the habits of gypsies but the majority were not a problem, the majority were settled, and few travelled. Often they had a permanent base and travelled in the summer months. Central Government were trying to carry out a comprehensive review. GF added that most of the incidents on highways occurred in summer.
- 4.3. GP asked what was the standard for land allocation?
- Answer – pitch would be about 500 square metres as a guide, but in fact travellers preferred smaller sites.
- The current sites were:
- 4 sites = 26 pitches
- 1 site = 6 pitches
- 4.4. TL enquired about the proposed traveller site at Hastings. It was noted that this site had been withdrawn because of fierce public opposition to the site.
- 4.5. PA asked about educational standards for the gypsy and traveller population.
- Answer Education – travellers had the lowest achievement record. Education was not seen as important, since they rely on rural skills. Children have to be accepted into schools.
- 4.6. Trudy McGuigan noted that travellers also have the worst health record.
- Death in maternity is double.
- Child mortality is three times as bad.
- Children are 17 times more likely to die.
- Lifespan is 10 years less.
- 4.7. RF noted that ESCC had been working on a site near Lewes for over a year, and yet gypsies had moved on and camped out in a weekend.
- Answer – ESCC work to nationally approved standards – gypsies do not.
- 4.8. PD stated that he had received a two page letter from ESCC, as a result of the pursuit of his personal case, without a single apology. It was full of apologies for the 91 days he and nearby residents had to suffer the effects of the incursion by gypsies. He declared that in his view the ESCC were not interested in the majority of decent residents, and were over caring with the treatment of the gypsy population. He noted that with a population of 1000 – 2000 gypsy and traveller population against a ESCC population of 500,000 this was a situation which the general public should not have to tolerate.
- He also noted that the gypsy population in East Sussex had just been given a lottery grant of £414,017, and yet there was no money available for decent people, and that all he had received was two pages of typed script.

In reply Trudy McGuigan said it was necessary to reconcile travellers' needs with the community, travellers are always required to keep off the highways, and although there are from time to time difficult legal cases the result always ends up with an order to move to a nominated site.

So far as the grant of £414,017 was concerned this was a grant obtained by a registered travellers group and was not ESCC funds.

- 4.9. Trudy McGuigan stated that she supported human rights, she understood that villages had been let down, but could not challenge the law, but noted that there were problems with the judicial process.
- 4.10. Graham Furness in answer to a question from RF stated that he had met with residents from the stub end of the old A267, and noted that it was a public highway and could not be closed without great expense, it was also impossible to restrict the use. However there had been cases of flytipping and it was possible to place CCTV cameras and CCTV signs which would also deter travellers. However if the travellers did return they would be moved off the highway, but the difficulty of alternative sites was always a problem.
- 4.11. CL noted that the remains of the old A267 were not needed and considered that it would easily be possible to make the road into a single carriageway. GF admitted that this would be possible but would be expensive because it meant breaking up the highway surface. CL noted that it was possibly a cheaper option than the legal costs of removing gypsies.
- 4.12. In answer to a question from CL it was noted that in the case of travellers on private lands, the landowner has more rights and it is much easier to get them off.
- 4.13. PD in a statement declared that a section 77 order had no effect because no-one will actually go. Trudy McGuigan pointed out that a section 77 order sets the eviction process off but regretted that it had taken 91 days to achieve this. BR noted that family relationships of the residents had been strained as a result of the gypsy incursion on the A267 being trapped by dogs and other animals and having to put up with rubbish. He considered that the Councils should learn from the experience, and speed up the process. Further he considered that if planning permission was used to get caravans on land, planners should not give one group rights over another.
- 4.14. RT noted that there was an action plan to resolve the gypsy issue and provide suitable sites. There was an opportunity in as much as Central Government were providing £5m per year over 5 years to provide sites. Now there was a need to find the sites. WDC needed to find 13 pitches. ESCC would succeed in providing sites but it would not be easy and would take at least two years and some difficult planning activity. He accepted a suggestion by DR that in some cases there would be public revolt, but assessments need to be made and the appeal process be used to get sites provided. There would be many problems but they would succeed.

5. MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 10 MARCH 2008 (7C11)

- 5.1. An amendment was accepted to Para 10.3 of the minutes, as was a minor amendment to minute 19.2.
- 5.2. With regard to minute 7C11/6.2, the Five Ashes Horticultural Society would help locate sites and provide wild flowers within Five Ashes.

ACTION GP

- 5.3. The minutes were accepted by UNANIMOUS VOTE.

6. MINUTES OF THE FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE HELD ON 31 MARCH 2008 (7F11)

- 6.1 A minor error was accepted to minute 7F11/5.3.
- 6.2 The Clerk would amplify minute 7F11/6.1 with regard to the lighting programme.
- 6.3 CL drew attention to the approval in principle for the funding of the proposed village gateway, subject to Traffic Committee approval and a number of caveats as laid down in the minutes. The issues and policy would be dealt with at the Traffic Committee meeting on 23 April 2008.

ACTION DT

- 6.4 The steps taken over Parish Council requirements for the proposed Mayfield Village Centre (Minute 7F11/8.1 – 7F11/8.7) were noted.
- 6.5 The position with regard the Best Village Competition was noted.
- 6.6 The arrangements for the Quality Council presentation were noted.
- 6.7 With regard to minute 7F9/3.5 it was noted that the stone pathway had not yet been removed, and that the Parish Council notice board could be moved into Five Ashes Village Hall grounds.

ACTION DT

- 6.8 The minutes were approved by UNANIMOUS VOTE.

7. FINANCE REPORT – FEBRUARY 2008 (7FA11)

- 7.1. CL summarised the key features of the Finance Report for February 2008 noting the year end results were forecast between £100,000 and £103,000. The Clerk noted the first shot provisional year end total was £101842.
- 7.2. PD considered that General Administration was so high and asked for an analysis. The Clerk noted that this would be provided as a matter of course through the F&GP Committee.

ACTION DT

8. REPORT FROM ESCC COUNCILLOR R TIDY

- 8.1. RT had no report but two questions with regard to traffic:
 - Could the junctions to Berkeley Road, Roselands Avenue and Wellbrook Avenue be made 30 mph?
 - Could such a 30 mph limit be extended from the three avenues up past the roundabout and up to Fir Toll Road?
- 8.2. PD replied that he thought it would be difficult to get such a 30 mph zone, but would ask for it to be placed on the Traffic Committee Agenda on 23 April 2008.

ACTION DT

- 8.3. DR thought that traffic would come through the roundabout at 50 mph and would then accelerate upwards, also that the NCN21 policy would influence the results. BR thought the section in its entirety should be 50 mph at most.

9. REPORT FROM WDC COUNCILLORS GRAHAM WELLS AND BRIAN REDMAN

9.1. GW reported on four issues:

- Landfill tax – where the council would be consulting on a number of solutions to the current problems.
- Concessionary bus passes – the House of Commons had insufficient money to fund all the pass holders needs. There was a suggestion that the provision of passes might be transferred from district to county level. This would save WDC £245,000.
- He drew attention to the request from Forest ROW for WDC to use schedule 4 of the 1982 general provision act to help remove unwanted street traders.
- The Corporate Plan was now available.

9.2. PD noted that ESCC had community grants available which could be used for travel – closing date was 30 April 2008.

9.3. With regard to the scheme to provide parking charges in Eastbourne, which had now been withdrawn RT reported that the scheme was still progressing. Considerable investment in parking meters and staff had already been committed. The legal delay caused by opposition parties had been sorted out, but consultation had to be carried out.

9.4. In answer to a question from PD; R Tidy explained that the Keep was the new archive centre to be located at Falmer. Costs were:

ESCC	£m
ESCC	11
Sussex University	5
Brighton & Hove Council	5
Other 1	<u>1</u>
	<u>22</u>

It would come on stream in 2010.

Some of the Sussex archives were 900 years old, and if they were not properly housed they would be taken over by Central Government.

10. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7P19 HELD ON 10 MARCH 2008 AND 7P20 HELD ON 31 MARCH 2008

10.1. The minutes were approved without amendment.

10.2. DR asked for information on the WDC letter referring to Mayfield Grange (minute 7P20/5.1). PD explained that the letter confirmed the amount of the Section 106 payment. The money would not come directly to Mayfield and Five Ashes. There was concern over the payment since affordable housing was not being provided.

11. WINCANTON SITE

- 11.1. PD had circulated a paper headed WDC Planning Application 2008/0582/MAJ Love Lane site (D/HOU/05/WIN) which gave the key issues appertaining to this most recent Planning Application for this site.

The current application proposed:

2 x 3/4 bedroom houses

6 x 3 bedroom houses

1 x 2 bedroom house – affordable

2 x 2 bedroom flats – affordable

Illustrations of the proposals were circulated.

In addition there were two commercial units and the refurbishment to the Retort House as a commercial unit.

There were a large number of protected trees involved with the site.

There had been an objection based on distance discrepancies from No 1 Mayfield Close which would need attention.

It was noted that an existing house would be demolished.

- 11.2. DR had concerns over business use. The site was designated for business use which the village needed, and at the current rate of building the Parish Council would meet its housing target well before the envisaged 10 year period was up.
- 11.3. CL noted that at best the scheme would not complete until 2012, but his concern was the lack of parking and would cause problems in Love Lane.
- 11.4. GP and JW liked the scheme and thought that it should be supported.
- 11.5. RF noted that the Retort House was to be brought into Commercial use. DR noted that the land probably suffered from industrial pollution and it would need to be checked. HH had received an enquiry about the use of the Retort House.
- 11.6. PA was concerned that the commercial buildings might not be taken up and that this would affect the housing site. DR noted that the Development Committee had discussed measures such as lowering rents which could be taken in order to encourage business start ups.

12. MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 17 MARCH 2008 (7D10)

- 12.1. The minutes were approved by UNANIMOUS VOTE without amendment.
- 12.2. DR reported on the progress being made with the plan, and noted that the Parish Council are now seeking consultation with WDC over the Conservation Area, and Development Area boundaries.

ACTION DT

13. MINUTES OF THE YOUTH COMMITTEE HELD ON 19 APRIL 2008 (7Y07) AND 25 APRIL 2008 (7Y07A)

- 13.1. An error was accepted to the minutes 7Y07, after which both sets of minutes were approved by UNANIMOUS VOTE.
- 13.2. DR reported that the Youth Drop-in Centre had opened on 1 April, and 12 people attended the first meeting and 8 on the second meeting. The Centre was being run by professionals.
- 13.3. DR noted that the first aid certificate for the youth leader was about to expire and the Clerk had arranged a refresher course at the request of the Committee.

14. MINUTES OF THE SECURITY COMMITTEE HELD ON 11 MARCH 2008 (7S06)

- 14.1. An error was accepted to the minutes which were approved by Council.
- 14.2. PD was concerned that the Traffic Committee had not been consulted on the speed watch issue.

RF replied that speed watch was not as such an agenda item, but part of a report from PCSO Mackie. The speed watch device was being used by PCSOs in the Hailsham area on a random basis. It would at some stage be deployed in Mayfield. PCSOs were doing all the work and volunteers were not being used.
- 14.3. HH noted that if the law was being broken then actions should be taken, rather than sending letters. TL noted that PCSOs were not issuing notices.

15. MINUTES OF THE COURT MEADOW MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 3 MARCH 2008 (7K03)

- 15.1. One error was accepted to the minutes which were then approved by UNANIMOUS VOTE.
- 15.2. Attention was drawn to the minutes 4.2 and 4.3 where it was noted that the lay members had suggested some radical policies to the Committee. These will be considered by the F&GP Committee at its next meeting.

ACTION DT

16. MAYFIELD PRE SCHOOL

- 16.1. The Council were asked to make the following Resolution, in order that arrangements for the use of a small area of additional land could be used by the Pre School as a play area. The Clerk explained that the reference to various documents would define the precise arrangements to be made.
- 16.2. The Resolution before the Parish Council was:

RESOLUTION 7K01

“That the Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council grant the use of the additional area of ground as shown on sketch 1, under the terms laid down in the solicitor’s letter of (date) April 2008, to the Mayfield Pre-School for the use of an additional play area for its users, and that the Mayfield Pre-School fence the area to the standards separately communicated to them in Document K001.”

The Resolution was approved by UNANIMOUS VOTE.

17 REPORTS FROM THE PARISH COUNCIL ARGOS HILL WINDMILL REPRESENTATIVE COUNCILLOR JANE DRISCOLL

17.1 Jane Driscoll read her Argos Hill Windmill Report of 14 April 2008 to the members of the Council.

A site meeting was arranged to take place at 11.00 am on 2 April 2008. The original purpose of this meeting (as agreed at the meeting of the potential Trustees on 28 Feb) was to:

- 1 Conduct a professional assessment of the cost of:
 - a) Renewing the tail pole and steps
 - b) Waterproofing the mill/renewing the weatherboarding.
- 2 Nigel Hannan to seek extra funding from WDC if the costs were estimated to be more than the £39,000 allocated.

When Brian Pike and Bob Bennett (Sussex Mills Group) arrived, just before the appointed time, they found that Ian Simmonds (WDC Surveyor), Josie McMillan (English Heritage) and Vincent Pargeter (Millwright) had met much earlier and had already reached conclusions without consultation with the other members of the group.

The conclusions drawn at this meeting reneged on what had been promised at the WDC meeting for potential trustees in February.

Their conclusions were:

- 1 Support the rear steps and tailpole.
- 2 Extend the scaffolding and plastic sheeting by 3 years (for which planning permission would be necessary).

WDC would no longer carry out the reboarding and weather proofing, which had earlier been agreed would take place as a matter of urgency, or replace the tail pole and rear steps. The Trust would be expected to do these at a later date.

The scaffolding was erected 4 years ago in order that WDC carry out essential repairs. Planning permission for the scaffolding expired a year ago ... an enforcement officer should have dealt with this. Local residents object strongly to the eyesore.

The Trust would now be expected to fund Vincent Pargeter's assessment as well as the cost of renewing the rear steps, tail pole and weatherboarding.

Initially Brian Pike thought that much of the funding was being withdrawn. Time and time again WDC has come forward with sums of money that they never actually spent! However subsequently WDC have declared that the £39,000 is still available.

The object of the site visit (to do a proper assessment of the costs in order that Wealden provide sufficient funding to cover the cost of the essential repairs and waterproofing – which had been thought to be nearer £60-70,000) was ignored. It would now appear that those who were prepared to volunteer as Trustees are no longer prepared to do so in the present circumstances. I would like to ask Councillor Redman:

- 1 Why the meeting started earlier than scheduled without notice to some of the participants?
- 2 Why a proper assessment and costings of works to the mill was not carried out at the site meeting as promised so that extra funding, if necessary, could be sought from WDC?
- 3 Will the £39,000 be available for immediate use as soon as a Trust is formed and will the £7,000 promised annually for the next 3 years be paid in 2008, 2009 and 2010?

- 17.2 The meeting convened for 11.00 am had actually started much earlier which meant that key trust members were not available to participate. This was considered unacceptable and as a consequence JD had put three questions to WDC through their representative BR. The questions also covered similar concerns voiced by Brian Pike (see 17.1 above).

18 REPORT FROM THE PARISH COUNCIL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE REPRESENTATIVE COUNCILLOR PAUL AMANS

- 18.1 PA reported that he had attended the AGM on the 18 March 2008, and had accepted a number of actions:

- To amend and update the Parish Directory.
- To investigate insurance provisions for the May Fair
- To attend ESCC economic development and partnership conferences
- To ensure Chamber of Commerce requirements were met.

- 18.2 There were no questions on the report.

19 REPORT FROM THE PARISH COUNCIL MAYFIELD COMMUNITY HALL REPRESENTATIVE

- 19.1 HH reported that he had attended the first meeting of the group where he had received a indifferent reception.

He had asked:

- Where was the project standing with regard to a sound delivery process?
- What were the expectations over the next 18 months?
- Minutes of meetings were not being delivered to the Parish office. Why?
- There was no evidence of an acceptable business plan.
- There was a proposal being mooted for the Parish Council to raise a £500,000 loan, from the loan board which was to be financed by the Parish Precept. HH considered this plan to be undeliverable.

- 19.2 IB said that a business plan had been presented twice to the Parish Council, and that they had outline costings provided by a professional Quantity Surveyor. Details of requirements had been made as their contribution to the Steering Committee. She suggested that the Parish Council was not helping on the project.

- 19.3 RF noted that:

- The Parish Council supported fully the plan put forward in minutes 6G03 and the subsequent resolutions 6G01, 6G02 and 6G03 dated 12 March 2007.
- The business plan placed before the Parish Council was that for a project costing £4.1m which had now been overtaken by events.

- 19.4 IB stated that the Parish Council had not committed land for the project. The Clerk replied that the area of land available for possible use had been outlined, but until the size of the footprint was known little further progress could be made. Details of the area of land potentially available was contained in Document 6GCP11 (Full). It was also noted by HH that the Community Centre Development Committee had not as yet specified what their exact requirements would be.

19.5 PD asked that the current situation be summarised on one piece of paper to be debated at the next meeting, so that the project could move forward.

ACTION DT

20 ELECTION OF FURTHER PARISH COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE TO SERVE ON THE MAYFIELD COMMUNITY HALL DEVELOPMENT GROUP

20.1 HH had requested an additional representative on this group in order that the Parish Council could be properly represented on this important project.

20.2 There was one proposal for a representative – J Bramwell.

JB had consented to serve.

Proposed HH Seconded DR Vote UNANIMOUS

JB was elected as the second representative on the Mayfield Community Hall Development Group.

21 REPORT FROM THE PARISH COUNCIL OLD PEOPLE'S WELFARE REPRESENTATIVE

21.1 DR reported that she had attended the last meeting, where the Committee, whilst noting that many of its original functions had been taken on by others, nevertheless decided that they would keep on meeting.

22 MINUTES OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 APRIL 2008

22.1 CL reported that the Committee had examined in depth and detail:

- Standing Orders
- VAT Process

The Clerk would take forward the actions proposed by the Committee.

23 BRIEF REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES NOT MEETING DURING THE PERIOD – TRAFFIC

23.1 PD reported that the next meeting of the Traffic Committee would be on 23 April and that the agenda would be sent out by the Clerk on the 16 April 2008.

ACTION DT

23.2 PD noted that the Newick Lane project had crept out of the chain of process and would need to be debated bearing in mind other Parish Council conflicting needs.

24 NEWICK LANE

TL outlined the present position with regard to developments on Newick Lane, noting that the issue had been placed on the Traffic Committee Agenda for the next week.

The residents group had been in contact with Brian Banks of ESCC with regard to:

- Weight restrictions for lorries
- White lining
- Bollards

It was noted that the original ESCC view had changed on a number of these projects and it would be necessary to challenge these views in particular with regard to lowering speed limits and the provision of a gateway.

TL reported that the Newick Lane issue had been covered in a 'Courier' article, and that he had also discussed the problems of NCN21 funding and speed restrictions with Charles Henry MP.

HH drew attention to a Times article on a similar problem.

PD considered the although the resident's action was commendable it was not the policy of the Parish Council, and that there were equal arguments for East Street and Fletching Street.

PD noted that ESCC had recently stated that with regard to the post 'Atkins' feasibility study for the NCN21, that there was no money available, and the project was on hold.

It was noted that Committee F (F&GP) had granted approval in principle for the gateway project subject to Traffic Committee debate at its meeting on 23 April 2008.

25 CLERK'S REPORT

There were no comments on the Clerk's Report.

26 ITEMS OF INFORMATION AND NEXT AGENDA ITEMS

GP asked when the pathway at Five Ashes Village Hall would be removed.

ACTION DT

JD asked that the size of the New Community Hall could be debated next month.

ACTION DT

JD noted that representatives were required for the proposed gypsy and travellers forum. It was agreed to place this items on the Annual Meeting Agenda.

ACTION DT

CL requested that Document 6GCP13 and associated minutes be circulated to all members.

ACTION DT

THE MEETING CLOSED AT 22.45 HOURS.

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE MAYFIELD AND FIVE ASHES PARISH COUNCIL WILL BE:

VENUE: MAYFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

DATE: 12 MAY 2008

TIME: 1930 HOURS