

STEDHAM WITH IPING PARISH PARISH MEETING NOTES

Held on: 26 August 2015 at 7 pm

At: Stedham Memorial Hall

To discuss: Stedham Sports Association's premises licence application for the new pavilion

Present: Eddie Lintott, Chairman of Stedham with Iping Parish Council (SIPC), was Chairman of the meeting.
Lucy Petrie, Vice Chairman SIPC, took the minutes in the absence of the Parish Clerk
37 parishioners in attendance including Parish Councillors

The Chairman opened the meeting with a synopsis of events to date.

He felt it was a pity that the goodwill which had characterised the fundraising, building and opening of the pavilion had disappeared after details of the licensing application had become public knowledge. The current situation caused concern and he would be asking Sue Yates to answer questions on behalf of the Stedham Sports Association Pavilion Committee (SSA). The Parish Council was not consulted as it would have been on a planning matter, but it could make its wishes known and would do so following the outcome of the meeting.

He then ran through the time sequence of events to date:

- The grant of a premises licence had been sought since June.
- 6/7/15 representatives of the Licensing Authority (Chichester District Council [CDC]) met with SY of SSA.
- 18/8/15 the Chairman received an email raising concerns of those living nearby.
- 1/9/15 the consultation process would close and there was no ability to extend this statutory deadline, but all objections would have to be sorted out before the licence granted.
- The current application covered all types of premises seeking licences and section M detailed how each individual licence would be controlled including any restriction on the hours.
- A parishioner by chance found out about the licence application on the internet; a notice was then put on the sports field gate and an advertisement appeared in the Midhurst & Petworth Observer. The parishioner subsequently put copies of the official licence application notice on the parish notice boards and delivered copies to nearby residents.
- SY emailed the clerk explaining the licence was for the bar to be used after sporting events and pre-booked social events. There would be 3 'external' events in 12 months (The Chairman noted that section M referred to 6) and 7 other social events, a total of 10 events per annum. The SSA wished to maximise fundraising to pay for the running costs.
- The Chairman had since received emails and verbal objections to and about the external events when bottles had been thrown into neighbouring gardens and music played later than the time set on the licence application.
- The Chairman paraphrased a letter he had received from MR: The Association had a responsibility to residents for quiet enjoyment; it should balance needs and avoid confrontation. He would like the application to be withdrawn and re-considered before being re-submitted.
- SM's (chairman of the pavilion development committee) email to members of the SSA pavilion committee was read to the meeting in full and is attached to the minutes.

SY then responded:

- She took the Chairman's comments on board.

- The SSA pavilion committee were currently using outsiders to run the bar under special licences, which meant the SSA did not make any profit from the sale of drinks.
- She had been to CDC, the Licensing Authority, and initially suggested the limited hours to cover the bar after sporting fixtures and practice, but was advised against this by the Licensing Authority as it would mean they had to apply for temporary licences each time there was an external event which required extended hours. The Authority suggested applying for full hours to cover all eventualities limited by restrictions in section M. SY felt the Authority was under time pressure and did not want to have to approve multiple special licences.
- The Pavilion was being used more and more.
- The Committee wanted an opportunity to use the building to run a bar in order to raise funds.
- There were increased costs with a larger building and higher cost of insurance cover.
- They were trying to be good custodians.
- She was disappointed personally that people felt they had gone behind their backs, when the SSA felt they had acted in everyone's best interest.

Questions and remarks from those present:

1. There was no consultation, only a notice on the fence. Why was there no consultation? Was there any chance of withdrawing the application?
SY: There would be no withdrawal. In retrospect they should have consulted residents.
2. Were there any other ways of raising money? The shouting at night after one of the parties down The Street was frightening.
3. On 26 June there was shouting and drunken louts in The Street at 12.40am and the taxis to pick up guests did not come until 12.20am.
SY: These could have been from another party, she had made sure all the guests had left. In rural areas taxis were not always on time. **Afternote:** At 12.40 the youths on the Recreation Ground were from another party. A local youth and his friends had been drinking at the Hamilton Arms celebrating the end of their exams and then toured the village before returning to the pub area.
4. The past behaviour at the Collins Club came back to haunt the current application and residents reacted because of that. Their fears needed to be allayed.
5. The current temporary licence stated the finish should be at 11pm and guests should leave by 11.30pm. This should have been adhered to. The same would happen in the future.
SY: They would try harder to be responsible for seeing all patrons on and off the premises. They would turn off the music and stop serving alcohol. They were learning as they went.
6. It was hard to face up to drunken louts in The Street at 1am and he failed to see how the committee could stop them, when the police found it hard.
7. Residents who complained should appreciate the use of the gate from their gardens onto the ground. If they paid £100 per annum for this privilege, this could be an alternative way of raising funds. Alcohol was only provided late for village weddings. After matches and practice sessions it was normal at any sporting venue to have a bar and people would be gone after only one or two drinks.
8. Offer archery lessons as an alternative income stream.
9. MD, who had been on the pavilion development committee, said the SSA had done a great job in the past. The problem now was with the technical advice received from the Licensing Authority. He suggested a maximum of 4 events a year to go to 11pm with a public commitment by the SSA to limit them to this and to give advance notification of events to residents.
10. David Burton, SIPC and SSA Chairman, felt residents were happy with the idea of a drink after matches and practice. The SSA would need to take MD's comments on board. His son's wedding last weekend had kept to times allowed. The SSA pavilion committee would meet next week to consider the points raised
SY: Agreed and would ask the Licensing Authority for more conditions, but the Authority would only include words that were enforceable.

11. Asked if alcohol is sold to take away.
SY: No
12. Sure the situation can be rectified
13. SF: The SSA Pavilion needed a committee to be responsible for the licence and policing it. She offered to be a resident member of the committee and to help with fundraising.
14. It would help if there was website to advertise any bookings and more details about what was going on.
SY: The information was currently on the wall chart at the pavilion.
15. Objections had to be raised by 1/9/15. How long would changes take to put in and how could amendments be made within the time scale?
SY: They would not withdraw the application. Mediation would be used to change the proposal because it was too expensive to re-submit (a resident offered to pay for the press advert, which was about £380)
16. Requested they withdrew the current licence and do a new one, with a year's duration to see how this worked in practice. What is the annual budget of the pavilion?
SY: The Licensing Authority would not do a year's licence. She had no idea of the annual budget. Currently they had only had to pay for the insurance.
17. Suggested that hours could be 4pm to 11pm for events and practice bar to a suitable time, bearing mind practice sessions ended at 8.30pm.
18. More social events please.
19. It is inconsiderate for cars to be parked by peoples gardens, this was noisy as they left late at night
David Burton: At the last event the cars were parked the far side of the field and this had worked better for residents.
20. The worst intrusion was sleep disturbance.
21. The original planning conditions were a bar to 21.30 hours with a maximum of 4 external events in summer, which could have an extension of hours. The planning permission ran alongside the licensing permission so one cannot override the other. The restriction in the planning permission would limit the licensing possible.
22. Squirrels had an event there without music and there were no problems with residents

Conclusions: SY said the current application would not be withdrawn. The SSA would need to agree whether to amend it for earlier closing and a fewer number of events in section M. The SSA pavilion committee would include a resident member, who would be SF.

The Chairman encouraged people to write with their objections so that they became part of the mediation process, which the Parish Council would be doing.

He suggested there was a new meeting after 1/9/15 once the mediation process had begun.

CONCLUSION 8.35

CHAIRMAN..... **Date**.....