

Worldham Parish Council
Minutes of Meeting held on Wednesday 2nd October 2019, 8pm
at East Worldham Village Hall

Present Cllr R Bagnell, Cllr T Blake, Cllr B Fife, Cllr K Malin

Also present Jane Ives, Clerk to Parish Council
4 members of the public

- 19.60 Appointment of Chair 2019/20:** Cllr Blake opened the meeting by reading out a letter from Cllr Brock who was not in attendance but who wished to be considered as Chairman following Cllr Aldridge's resignation following his house move away from the Parish. The Clerk confirmed that HALC had provided advice that Cllr Brock could be appointed even though he was not in attendance, providing he signed the Declaration of Office prior to the next meeting.
It was **RESOLVED** to appoint Cllr Brock as Chairman of Worldham Parish Council until the next Annual Meeting in May 2020. **Proposed: Cllr Fife. Seconded: Cllr Bagnell.**
It was **RESOLVED** to appoint Cllr Blake to chair the meeting in the absence of the Chairman.
Cllr Blake wished to record a vote of thanks to Cllr Aldridge for all his work whilst on the Council. His contribution has been substantial and he will be missed.
- 19.61** It was **RESOLVED** to defer the appointment of a Vice-Chair until the next council meeting when the new Chairman would be in attendance.
- 19.62 Apologies for absence** were noted from Cllr W Brock. Apologies had also been received from District Councillor Ken Carter.
- 19.63 Declarations of Interests – None**
- 19.64** It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 4th September 2019.
Proposed: Cllr Bagnell. Seconded: Cllr Fife.
Matters arising: Cllr Bagnell wished to provide clarity around the broadband update provided at the last meeting. She felt that not everyone in East Worldham was aware that fibre broadband was finally available, earlier than planned, and that a notice on the website might now be useful.
- 19.65** The Chairman adjourned the meeting for **Public Questions:**
A member of the public was concerned that a large polytunnel had been erected on Oaklands Farm and wanted to know whether planning permission was required. Additional questions were raised about polytunnels erected on other local properties and the Clerk will establish what the rules are regarding planning permission. **Action: Clerk**

A member of the public had emailed the Clerk prior to the meeting about planning application reference 55638/001 regarding an application at Wilsom Lane which the Council had not been consulted on. The Clerk said that, following a discussion with the Planning Officer, the Council had now been consulted and an extension agreed for comments until after the next Council meeting.

A member of the public wished to provide further information regarding the agenda item about VE Day 75. A group of residents would like to organise a celebration on 10th May with entertainment provided. She read out minutes of a Council meeting held in 1945 regarding celebrating peace following the war which were signed by Cllr William Brock. The group wished to apply for funding from the Worldham Community Benefit Fund.
- Meeting reconvened.**
- 19.66 VE Day 75 Celebration:** Councillors agreed that the Worldham Community Benefit Fund was set up to bring benefit to the Parish and the suggested VE Day 75 Celebration entirely matched the criteria. Therefore the Council would be happy to support the proposal but would require firm figures to be provided at the next meeting.

19.67

Planning Applications:

Previous Planning Applications (Appendix 1) – The table at Appendix 1 was noted regarding previous planning applications with no amendments since the last meeting.

SDNP/19/03709/FUL Oaklands Farm, Green Street, East Worldham, GU34 3AU

Cllr Blake had circulated the comments agreed by the Council in response to the previous withdrawn application. He said that, based on his initial review of the planning application, there appeared to be little change from the previous application. Cllr Blake wished to seek clarification from the Planning Officer about who had provided a response on flood systems & drainage as it wasn't clear from the SDNPA website. He also wished to seek clarification on the response from HCC Water as it suggested that the site was under 0.2 hectares and therefore not in their remit. This seems to be wholly inaccurate.

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the application with the Council's full response provided at Appendix 2.

Proposed: Cllr Blake. Seconded: Cllr Fife.

Additionally, Councillors were concerned that there had been no consultation regarding the footpath on site and the Clerk will follow this up with Hampshire County Council. **Action: Clerk**

19.68

Parish Council Finances/Administration:

a) It was **RESOLVED** to part fund the Clerk's membership to the Society of Local Council Clerk's with Greatham Parish Council at a cost of £87.50 for one year. **Proposed: Cllr Blake. Seconded: Cllr Fife.**

b) It was **RESOLVED** to approve the following payments. **Proposed: Cllr Malin. Seconded: Cllr Fife.**

Invoice date	Payee	Description	Net	VAT	Total
30/09/19	Clerk	Salary September 2019	£737.00		£737.00
30/09/19	Clerk	Repayment of expenses - toner cartridge	£33.74	£6.75	£40.49
27/09/19	DG Design & Print	Leaflet printing costs	£17.50		£17.50
03/09/19	PKF Littlejohn	External audit fees	£200.00	£40.00	£240.00
01/11/19	SLCC	Part payment for membership	£87.50		£87.50
	Southern Electric	Village Hall Electricity	£181.83		£181.83
	Castle Water	Village Hall Water Rates	£24.13		£24.13
			£1,281.70	£46.75	£1,328.45

c) The **Financial Report** at Appendix 3 was noted.

The Clerk advised that the bank balances are as follows:

Current Account: £ 4,727.02

Worldham Community Benefit Fund: £13,153.17

Deposit Account: £12,429.23

The Clerk advised that the SDNPA had asked the Council to consider projects for S106 legacy funding that would expire soon. Agreed projects are needed by the end of December 2019. Councillors discussed various options included phase 2 of the traffic mitigation measures previously agreed and potential improvements to pedestrian access on Worldham Hill. It was agreed that Cllr Malin and the Clerk would form a working party to look at all options.

d) **Draft Budget 2020/21:** It was agreed that the Clerk would present a draft budget at the next meeting rather than appoint a working party to consider this.

e) **Financial Regulations:** It was **RESOLVED** to adopt Financial Regulations using the NALC model regulations adapted by the Clerk for the Council. **Proposed: Cllr Malin. Seconded: Cllr Fife.**

f) **Notice of Conclusion of Audit 2018/19:** The Conclusion of Audit had been received with no matters for attention and the relevant notices are on the parish noticeboards and the website.

19.69

It was **RESOLVED** for the Clerk to set up new Councillor email addresses for all councillors in order that the Council becomes fully compliant with the General Data Protection Regulations 2018. **Action: Clerk**

19.70

Councillor Responsibilities 2019/20: Further to the resignation of Cllr Aldridge and also the appointment of new councillors, it was **RESOLVED** to make the following changes to councillor responsibilities for this year:

- Highways (Road and traffic)	All councillors
- Minerals and waste	Cllr Blake
- Planning	All councillors
- Playground, Families and Children	Cllr Bagnell
- South Downs National Park	All councillors
- Village Hall	Cllr Malin
- AMA/Jalsa Salana liaison	Cllr Blake

Additionally, the Clerk will assume responsibility for the following areas:
Communications including King's World
Website

- 19.71 Playground:** The Clerk had circulated a report regarding an issue with the playground (Appendix 4). The multi-play unit at the playground is currently out of action due to decay/algae noted on 3 timbers following maintenance work carried out by Kompan. A recent playground inspection had identified no issues with the playground so councilors were very concerned that the manufacturer believed that work needed to be done to make this unit safe. The Clerk had obtained one quotation for repair and had spoken to the Council's insurers who had advised carrying out a new independent inspection. However, Kompan are reviewing their decision about whether the repairs can be carried out under warranty as their original advice was that the timbers needed no maintenance and carried a 15 year warranty and had only been in place for 6 years. There may also be an opportunity to use some legacy S106 funding to part fund a replacement unit. It was **RESOLVED** to delegate authority to the Clerk to get an additional inspection carried out if necessary but in the meantime the Clerk will investigate all options regarding the work needed and these will be brought back to the next meeting. **Proposed: Cllr Fife. Seconded: Cllr Bagnell.**
- 19.72 Jalsa Salana Update:** Cllr Blake and Cllr Bagnell had recently attended a wash up meeting held at EHDC and provided a report (Appendix 5). Representatives from the AMA had been unable to attend but had telephoned in to the meeting. Cllr Blake advised that signs at the Selborne end of West Worldham road and the A31 end of Wyck Road had previously been agreed but had not happened. Cllr Blake had told the meeting that this must happen next year in order to try and alleviate the traffic problems in and around Worldham. The next meeting will take place in February 2020.
- 19.73 Hampshire County Council Consultation on diversion of footpath 16B:** The diversion is to accommodate a new bridge that has been installed. The Council have no objection to the diversion.
- 19.74 Roads, Pavements and Footpaths:**
Lengthsman: Cllr Bagnell was keen that the Council progress with setting up a new parish cluster and had spoken to a local contractor who would be happy to provide a quotation. **Action: Clerk**
Councillors identified that the pavement from the village hall to the bus stop areas needed clearing and the Clerk will add this to the lengthsman tasks. **Action: Clerk**
- 19.75 Broadband Update:** It was noted that West Worldham had not yet been connected but in other outlying areas some progress had been made.
- 19.76 Reports/Updates from Councillors/Clerk:**
Cllr Malin was keen for the Council to have a Facebook page. This will be added to the next agenda. Councillors noted that the website needs updating and the Clerk will action this and also check whether planning applications can be viewed via the website. **Action: Clerk**
- 19.77** The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 6th November 2019. The Chairman closed the meeting at 10pm

Signed:

Date:

Appendix 1: Planning Application Tracker

Date registered	Reference	Address	Consultation expiry date	Proposal	WPC comments	Decision
09/08/2019	57718/001	The Clock House, Truncheaunts Lane, East Worldham GU34 3AA	12/09/2019	Change of use of land from part of residential grounds of Truncheaunts Farm to residential garden of the Clock House	No objection	
31/05/2019	33920/009	Wilsom Farmhouse, 60 Wilsom Road, Alton GU34 2SP	11/07/2019	Detached double garage (part retrospective consent)	No comments	Permission
31/05/2019	51471/006	Unit 7 Waterbrook Estate, Alton GU34 3US	15/07/2019	Variation of conditions 5, 11 and 18 of planning permission 51471/003 to allow for importation of road planings and the night time importation and exportation of waste		Refused. Appeal APP/Q1700/18/32176 98
11/04/2019	SDNP/19/01821/HOUS	Land adjacent to 6 Drove Cottages, Blanket Street, East Worldham	19/06/2019	Addition of store cupboards to exterior	No objection	Permission
17/05/2018	57718	The Clock House, Truncheaunts Lane, East Worldham GU34 3AA	26/06/2018	Deed of variation on S106 agreement on app. ref 27227/006 to remove the rental clause	No objection	Awaiting decision

06/03/2019	52717/001	Land at junction of Wilsom Road, Windmill Lane, Alton	16/04/2019	Three bed detached dwelling	No comments	Refused
24/01/2019	SDNP/19/00346/FUL	Land South of Green Street, East Worldham GU35 9NN	04/03/2019	Proposed new vehicular access & grassed tiled turning area	Objection	Refused. Appeal APP/Y9507/W/19/322 6789

Appendix 2: Response to Planning Application SDNP/19/03709/FUL Oaklands Farm, Green Street, East Worldham, GU34 3AU

Worldham Parish Council OBJECTS to this planning application.

SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS

For the reasons given below Worldham Parish Council (WPC) believes this application fails to meet the bar set by the NPPF for major development within National Parks and for meeting National Park Purposes. Section 172 of the NPPF states that *'planning permission should be refused for major developments other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest'*. It is WPC's view that neither of these criteria have been shown to have been met.

Exceptional Circumstances: Section 172 of the NPPF, and reflected in Core Policy SD3 of the SDNP Local Plan, states that consideration of 'exceptional circumstances' should include the following three requirements:

a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;

No case has been made for the need for the development at this particular location. Also, no evidence is provided that supports statements in the application that the event benefits the local economy. WPC's informal surveys of businesses in the area indicate that, on balance, it has a detrimental effect for local businesses.

b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way;

No compelling information is provided to justify the siting of this event in its current location with its considerable constraints. The planning officer did not address this point in his response to the previous application. Other sites are available nationally which are designed for events of this nature and better served with transport infrastructure.

c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

We do not believe that the additional supporting information provided with this application changes the position expressed by the planning officer in his recommendation for refusal for the previous application ie that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not impact adversely on the landscape of the area and the Designated Sites in the immediate locality.

Development in the Public Interest: In the planning officer's Recommendation for refusal of the AMA's previous application he states that *'..it is considered that the development is in the public interest'*. However, he makes no supporting case for this statement nor states the criteria on which it is based. There is, therefore, no transparency in the way this decision has been reached. To the extent that it is detrimental to our local communities and businesses, as evidenced by the public response to both this and the previous application, and our surveys of local businesses, it is difficult to see where the public interest lies. Enjoyment of this area of the National Park by the general public is diminished during the period of the event due to difficulty of access, interruption of rights of way and noise.

National Park Purposes: For the reasons given in more detail below, WPC believes that the holding of the event, over a proposed seven week period is in direct conflict with the two statutory purposes for national parks set down in the Environment Act 1995. Further, we maintain that it fails *'to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities'* in this area of the SDNP.

Temporary Nature of the Event: Reference is made in a number of the application documents (and the Planning Officer's report on the previous application) to the temporary nature of the event as an alleviating argument for the acceptance of the extended period. There is an acknowledgement of the negative impact of the event on the character of the area in Section 6.1.5 of the Planning Statement, which includes the statement *'The character of the area while harmed for a short period of time is retained and safeguarded for 45 weeks per annum....'*. There is however, nothing in para 172 of the NPPF which differentiates temporary development from longer term and permanent development. Whilst we would recognise that there may be a balance to be struck, there is nevertheless no provision in this policy which allows it to be set aside for temporary development, particularly for temporary development which has a negative impact on the landscape and, by definition, is contrary to the National Park's primary purposes. Whilst 7 weeks may be considered 'temporary', it is nevertheless a not insignificant period of time

during which activities are carried on which have a detrimental effect on the National Park, the local ecology and the local community.

Impact on the Local Ecology – Policy SD9: Further surveys have been carried out which confirm the existence of protected species on the site and adjacent land. There are limits to what the recommended mitigation measures can achieve. Mitigation is not the same as *‘conserving and enhancing’*. The extent of lighting, noise and general disturbance across the site over a 7 week period will inevitably have a detrimental effect on the local ecology, contrary to Policy SD9.

Dark Night Skies – Policy SD8: The application site is within an area designated as a Dark Skies Transition Zone. Even if the recommended lighting plan is diligently implemented, an event of this size and nature will inevitably require levels of lighting which put it in conflict with the National Park’s dark night skies policy. Additional comments on this issue are made below.

Relative Tranquillity – Policy SD7: The southern part of the Oaklands Farm event site and the adjacent conservation areas to the south and west fall within an area of high tranquillity as shown in the South Downs National Park Tranquillity Study. Considerable noise is generated during the whole period of the event, including the set up and dismantling period as described in detail below. This is contrary to SDNP Local Plan policy SD7 which states that *‘Development proposals will only be permitted where they conserve and enhance relative tranquillity...’*. There is nothing in the application to demonstrate that the development conserves and enhances relative tranquillity. Surprisingly, no reference is made to this in the planning officer’s recommendation for refusal to the previous application. A more detailed commentary on noise resulting from the event is made below.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE APPLICATION DOCUMENTS

WPC considers that there are deficiencies in the application, including lack of supporting information and documentation and errors of fact.

Omission of Supporting Information

WPC considers that for a planning proposal of this significance, and impact on the local area, the application should be accompanied by the following detailed assessments:

- a) Lighting assessment
- b) Noise assessment
- c) Air quality assessment

In particular, noise and lighting have been major sources of disturbance for residents in proximity to the application site, as well as having a potentially negative impact on the adjacent habitats of protected and vulnerable species. A large area of the site, and the adjacent Designated Sites, have been classified as being within an area of high tranquillity, and a Dark Night Skies Transition Zone.

Whilst recommendations are made for mitigating the effects of lighting on bats, we believe the wider impact of lighting on protected species and the SDNPA’s dark skies requires a much more thorough assessment. We also believe that, with the volume of traffic accessing the site, the event has a significant effect on the air quality to the detriment of biodiversity in the local area, as well as local residents.

Incorrect and Disputed Statements in the Application Form

Section 5) Has change of use already started? The applicant has answered ‘No’ to this question. Our information is that the site contains storage and other facilities and equipment related primarily to use for the Jalsa Salana and for which permission is being sought retrospectively. The purpose of the application is to legitimise these planning breaches and extend the allowed period of the event beyond the 28 day permitted development period.

Section 8)

a) *Is a new or altered vehicle access proposed to or from the public highway?* The applicant has answered ‘No’ to this question – Our understanding is that there are three permitted vehicle accesses from Green Street into Oaklands Farm. In recent years a fourth temporary access point has been opened up during the period of the event. As far as we are aware this is not a permitted access point. The Transport Statement refers to this access as 2a, and indicates an intention to continue using it during periods of the event. If so, it should be included within the planning application.

Section 11) How will surface water be disposed of? The applicant has ticked ‘Mains Sewer’. In fact there is no mains sewer in this area.

Section 12) *Is there a reasonable likelihood of the following being affected adversely or conserved and enhanced within the application site, or on land adjacent to or near the application site?*

a) *Protected and priority species* -The applicant has answered 'No' to this question. In fact, great crested newts have been recorded on the application site. In addition some 27 Protected Species have been recorded within 1 km of the application site, many of them in much closer proximity (100 metres or less). The latest Bat Survey records the presence of some seven species of bats on the site and in the adjacent woodland, including rare species.

Section 13) *Please state how foul sewage is to be disposed of?* – The applicant has again ticked 'Mains Sewer'. As stated above, there is no mains sewer in this area.

Section 22) *Can the site be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land?* - The applicant has answered 'No' to this question. In fact the site can clearly be seen from the B3004 from Worldham Hill and where the road runs alongside most of its northern boundary. In addition it can be seen from footpath 27 which crosses the site, from Kingsley bridleway 1, from the Hangers Way and from Binswood Common which is open access land.

COMMENTS ON THE PLANNING STATEMENT

Section 1.3.4 states that the average number of participants is around 30,000 annually. In fact, annual attendance for the last three years has exceeded 37,000 based on information provided by the AMA.

Section 2.2.1 gives a misleading description when it says there are very few neighbours to the development, citing only Woodland Farm, a farm to the north, and a small terrace of residential housing to the north west of the site. In fact there are 7 properties in close proximity to the eastern boundary of the site, where only Woodland Farm is mentioned (and wrongly designated in the accompanying aerial view). Towards the west numerous properties comprising the main village of East Worldham are within a short distance of the western boundary of the site, on rising ground overlooking the site.

Section 2.4.1 cites a number of large scale precedents within the National Park. We do not consider these are relevant to this application, or comparable, for various reasons. In particular, it does not meet the second purpose of the National Park as, being a religious event open only to its own members, it is not accessible by the public at large. The intensity of the event and density of the development allows no sense of being in the National Park and therefore can hardly be considered as meeting the second purpose of the National Park, even if it were open to the public.

Section 2.5.1/2 WPC are surprised to learn that the SNDPA have ruled that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required. It is our opinion that, although of a temporary nature, the event may well have a lasting impact on the area, and particularly on the protected species identified in the Preliminary Ecological Assessment. Extending the period of the event, including the period of erection and dismantling, is likely to exacerbate the impact. The absence of an Air Quality Assessment does not allow an assessment of the impact of air pollution on the local area and biodiversity.

Section 3.1.9 This section includes a statement of commitment to ensuring the Dark Night Skies within the farm. However, it should be noted that the AMA have already had ample opportunity to show their commitment to this key policy of the SDNP but have failed to do so. For the 11 months of the year outside of the 4 weeks of the Jalsa Salana event, bright lights are switched on from dawn to dusk along a long length of the northern boundary, in the Parish Council's view, quite unnecessarily. Despite being asked by the Parish Council to respect the Dark Skies policy to remove them or replace them with PIR lights, no action has been taken.

Section 4.1.2 The suggestion in this section is that there is a presumption in favour of development. In fact National Parks are excluded from the presumption in favour of development under para 11 of the NPPF.

Section 5.1.2 – 3 Reference is made in these sections to Paragraph 116 of the NPPF. In the latest version of the NPPF this has been replaced by Paragraph 172.

The applicant states that the Jalsa Salana makes a significant contribution to the local area through increased visitors as well as sourcing of materials and produce. No evidence is provided to support this statement. WPC believes that very little sourcing of materials and produce is done in the local area. Informal enquiries by WPC of a number of local businesses which might be expected to benefit from an influx of visitors suggest that the event generally has a negative effect on business. Participants in the event, in the main, just pass through the area on their way to and from the site and tend not to stop and buy goods and services locally. Local trade is reduced as regular customers stay away from the area due to the severe congestion on the surrounding roads. In particular, in this largely

agricultural area, farmers have been significantly impacted at the height of the harvesting season by congestion in particular on the minor roads, preventing them from travelling between fields with their large agricultural machinery.

Section 5.1.4 - 6 The Motocross event at Alresford for which the appeal was upheld by the Planning Inspectorate is not a valid comparison and does not establish a general principle for large scale events of a temporary nature in the National Park. Every case must be examined on its merits and there are significant differences between the Jalsa Salana and the Motocross event, not least duration of the use, nature of the site, access to the general public, impact on wildlife etc. The comparison here is between 3 days for the Motorcross compared to 7 weeks for the Jalsa Salana. WPC refutes the statement that the event already provides a substantial contribution to the local area. As we have already stated the event provides no measurable economic or other benefits to the local area that we are aware of. In fact, our enquiries show the reverse is the case.

We also refute the statement that the measures proposed as part of this application will provide substantial environmental improvements. It is not clear what improvements are referred to, other than screening of the storage containers and other unsightly event equipment and the reinstatement of the hedgerow along the northern boundary which was removed some two years ago.

Section 5.1.9- 11 WPC supports the proposal for removing the unsightly kitchen extract flues but it should be noted that the installation of the flues was done, and remains, in breach of the planning conditions stipulated when planning permission for the kitchen was granted. This could be achieved by planning enforcement.

The farm cannot be considered as a serious agricultural enterprise. It is apparent that the AMA's ownership and use of the site is principally for the holding of the Jalsa Salana event. The extent of agricultural activity carried out on the farm since being in the AMA's ownership can only be described as 'hobby' farming and a token gesture to a commercial farming enterprise. The High Level Farming Plan also cannot be regarded as a serious plan for commercial farming. However, this is not necessarily detrimental from a landscape point of view provided it is not despoiled by non- agricultural, unsightly clutter, which it is at the moment.

Section 5.2 Transport and Traffic - Traffic volume and congestion is the most commented upon issue associated with the Jalsa Salana event by local residents, within our own parish, but also in the adjacent villages of Kingsley, Oakhanger/Selborne, Wyck and Binsted. The disruption and delays caused to local people and businesses, as well as commuters and vehicles generally using the B3004 between Alton and Bordon on the days of the event is significant. The site is not well served by the local road infrastructure for handling the large numbers of vehicles experienced at peak hours, by comparison with, for example, the Matterley Estate (Boomtown festival). The nearest intersections from the main trunk roads, the A31 and A325, are located some 4 miles and 2.5 miles respectively from the site, funnelling traffic onto the B3004. The B3004 itself is a relatively narrow road with few laybys and passing places.

Whilst recognising that the AMA have taken steps to reduce the number of cars travelling to, and parking at the site, considerable congestion occurs along the B3004 which accesses the site with queues of traffic several miles long, stationary for long periods of time during peak times. Several narrow country lanes join into the B3004, and these have been used by participants in an attempt to short circuit the long tailbacks on the B3004, despite signs diverting traffic away from these roads, adding further to the congestion as they try to feed into the main queue. As mentioned above, these country lanes are often used by large farm vehicles and machinery, particularly during the harvesting period which invariably coincides with the event. This has resulted in a number of confrontations and near accidents.

There is concern that emergency vehicles would be unable to access residential and other properties in the area for significant periods of time during the periods of congestion, heightening risks for local residents, or victims of accidents. The Emergency Vehicle Plan in the Transport Statement deals only with access gates into the site and does not address this wider issue. This restricted access to the site raises the question as to its suitability as a venue for an event of this size. We regard the Emergency Vehicle Plan as inadequate for dealing with emergencies requiring attendance by emergency vehicles, whether on the application site, or within the area of the surrounding villages which are affected by traffic congestion.

Parking for up to 5000 cars is provided at Country Market, Sleaford, some 2.5 miles from the site, and from where participants are 'bussed' into the site. This arrangement brings its own problems in terms of congestion to the area. It is not known how robust this arrangement is. If the site became unavailable finding alternative parking space of adequate capacity in a suitable location could present a major problem.

Section 5.2.16-17 (Right of Way) This is a proposal to divert the public footpath which crosses the site for 21 days during the event period. It is not clear how they propose to do this legitimately. WPC is not aware of any process whereby they can close a public right of way for 21 days. For every year to date they have diverted the footpath without authorisation. Reference is made to a 'mark-up' of the proposed diversion and new rights of way but we are unable to locate this within the planning documents.

Section 5.3.1 (Noise) states that there are few sensitive receptors in close proximity to the site. We dispute this statement. Noise is created from a number of sources, affecting residents:

- Public address system – this is used, mainly during the 3 day event, for calls to prayer, speeches and communal prayers. Calls to prayer are sometimes made during the middle of the night and have woken residents at 3am up to a mile away.
- Generators for lighting – These are switched on at dusk and off at morning light. The generators produce a continuous hum, audible throughout the night in properties in close proximity to the site.
- Reversing Alarms on construction vehicles – a number of vehicles fitted with reversing alarms are used during construction and dismantling of the site infrastructure, which typically lasts for 25 days, and are used more or less continuously during the working hours (8am to 8pm). Traditional (bleeper) alarms can be heard at a considerable distance from the site, probably between 500 to 1000 metres, and sometimes farther. Following years of complaints by local residents a number of the vehicles have now been fitted with white noise alarms which cannot be heard outside of the site. However, some vehicles with loud reversing alarms are still used and are a considerable irritant and disturbance to residents within hearing range, affecting peaceful enjoyment of their properties.

In addition, vehicles making deliveries and collections to and from the site are often fitted with reversing alarms. Whilst the AMA may have little or no control over these vehicles, they add to the general level of noise generated on site.

- Temporary metal tracks – vehicles driving over metal trackways which have not been laid on flat ground create a rattling noise which is a disturbance to residents in close proximity to the site, particularly when used by vehicles into the night.

Noise also has a detrimental impact on wildlife. In particular, noise which continues through the night has a detrimental impact on many of the protected nocturnal species, particularly bats and barn owls, which have been recorded in close proximity to the application site.

The South Downs National Park Tranquillity Study shows the site and the surrounding countryside to be within an area of high relative tranquillity. Considerable noise is generated during the whole period of the event, including the set up and dismantling period as described in detail below. This is contrary to SDNP Local Plan policy SD7 which states that *'Development proposals will only be permitted where they conserve and enhance relative tranquillity...'*. There is nothing in the application to demonstrate that the development conserves and enhances relative tranquillity.

Section 5.4 (Dark Skies) The lighting associated with the current running of the event is switched on before dusk and remains on until daylight the following day, illuminating the whole site and beyond. Skyglow from the site has been reported as far as 5 miles away. Neighbours in close proximity to the site have been affected by lights shining directly into their bedrooms and have reported occasions when they have had to get out of bed and ask for the offending lights to be directed away from their properties.

The inevitable light spill extends beyond the boundary of the site, including into the adjacent conservation sites, with unknown but inevitable consequences for protected nocturnal species. The extent and intensity of the lighting is such that the mitigation measures proposed are unlikely to result in any significant reduction in the impact of the lighting on the surrounding area unless the illuminated area is considerably reduced, both in terms of intensity and extent, and the period during which the site is illuminated is considerably reduced. There is a clear conflict here with the South Downs Local Plan Dark Skies Policy SD8.

Section 5.5 (Landscape Visual Appraisal) Infrastructure (tents, marquees, portakabins etc) can be seen increasingly from an early stage in the erection period, through to the final removal over the last few days of the dismantling period, currently a total period of 4 weeks. If the application were to be permitted, it would result in this period being extended to 7 weeks.

The LVA does not contain photos or visualisations of the site during the 3 day event or during the construction or dismantling period. As such, it gives little sense of the impact of the development on the landscape. The density and extent of the development during the event gives participants and visitors limited visibility of the landscape, with no sense of being in the National Park or even in the countryside, apart from the grass underfoot. It can therefore hardly be regarded as fulfilling the National Park purpose of *'promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public'*, even if it were open to the public. In fact we would argue that

access to and enjoyment of the National Park in this area is inhibited for the general public during the period of the event due to traffic congestion on local roads, and the noise and disruption caused by the event, and unlawful diversion of the footpath across the site.

There are several photos from Green Street (B3004) with views into the site from the northern boundary. These photos give a rather limited sense of the extent of visibility into the site from the public road. This boundary was formerly delineated by a natural hedgerow which restricted views into the site. The removal of the hedgerow in 2016 opened up unsightly views from the road of an untidy array of clustered buildings, including, inter alia, the kitchen and its external flues, and numerous shipping containers. Comments have been received by members of the parish council concerning the increasingly industrialised appearance of the site from this section of Green Street where, formerly, it just formed part of the rural landscape, living up to its name. Hedgerows have also been removed along the southern boundary with Binswood. The Planning Statement reinforces this point when it acknowledges that '*the condition of the site has reduced in recent times*' (5.5.3). Whilst we welcome the proposal for replanting boundary hedging, it should be seen as doing no more than replacing what was previously there before it was removed by the AMA's contractors and can hardly be claimed as an enhancement measure.

The mitigation measures proposed for the external storage locations (presumably the shipping containers) is to rearrange them so they will be masked from public view (5.5.7). The Landscape Masterplan proposes screening the area with additional planting of native trees. Whilst additional tree planting is to be welcomed it will be many years before they grow to a point where they provide effective screening. Nevertheless, the existence of large numbers of these containers, however screened, in an agricultural/rural landscape, we consider to be in conflict with the NPPF requirement for conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the landscape in National Parks.

Section 5.6 (Biodiversity) The application site is adjacent to Binswood SSSI, the Wick Wood and Worldham Hangers SSSI, and the East Hampshire Hangers SAC. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment submitted with the previous application listed some 27 protected species as having been recorded within 1KM of the site, many of them within 100 metres or less. The Bat Survey accompanying the application reorders seven species of bat (including the rare Barbastelle bat) on the site and the adjacent woodland. Despite the proposed mitigation measures, the potential for disturbance to many of these protected species, their habitats and foraging areas from the running of this event with its attendant nocturnal noise and lighting is high. This is in conflict with Policy SD9 which seeks to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Mitigation is not the same as conserving and enhancing. WPC has reservations as to how well the mitigation measures can be practicably implemented.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Planning policies applying to the SDNP are contained in the NPPF, the South Downs Local Plan 2019 and the East Hampshire Local Plan (Joint Core Strategy) 2014.

National Planning Policy Framework

In respect of National Parks, para 172 of the NPPF states:

Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks....which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations, and should be given great weight....

The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning permission should be refused for major developments other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;*
- b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and*
- c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.*

The South Downs Local Plan 2019

The following policies are considered relevant to this application:

SD3: Major Development

SD4: Landscape Character

SD6: Safeguarding Views

SD7: Relative Tranquillity
SD8: Dark Night Skies
SD9: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
SD11: Trees, Woodland & Hedgerows
SD19: Transport & Accessibility

WPC's comments in respect of the issues covered by these policies have been made in the relevant sections of this document.

East Hampshire Local Plan (Joint Core Strategy) 2014.

CP19: Development in the countryside
CP20: Landscape
CP21: Biodiversity

WPC's comments in respect of the issues covered by these policies have been made in the relevant sections of this document.

Planning Decision Conditions

However, if the SDNPA is minded to grant permission for this application we would request that the following conditions be included to mitigate the impact of the event, in particular on our local residents, our landscape, wildlife and users of this area of the National Park:

- Permission should be given for a 3 year temporary period
- Total time allowed for the event including construction and dismantling – 35 days. The application has requested 7 weeks but no justification has been given for extending it for such a long period. We believe this is excessive and unnecessary. Whilst the AMA do not always succeed in managing the event within the 28 days permitted development period, we believe an extra 7 days is adequate. The longer this working period is extended the greater the potential for disruption to the area, particularly for its impact on protected species and their habitats, and the public's enjoyment of this area of the National Park.
- The period of the event to be limited to 3 days. The intensity of the event reaches a peak in terms of lighting, noise, traffic etc over the days of the event. Extending it by a further day extends the local disruption unnecessarily.
- Permission should be limited to one event, the Jalsa Salana. No other events to be allowed.
- Limit the number of participants who can attend the event to 30,000
- Limit the number of vehicles parking on site <3,000
- Restriction on the use of access gate 2a for the 3 days of the event. This should not become a permanent access.
- Limits on the hours of working during the construction and dismantling period from 7am to 5pm
- Limit on the lighting, to be specified, but at a level which causes minimum disruption to residents and wildlife.
- Limits on noise, to be specified, but at a level which causes minimum disruption to residents and wildlife, and including a ban on bleeper reversing alarms which can be heard well beyond the site, and which should be replaced by 'white noise' alarms.
- Limits on the number and use of B8 storage units.
- Appropriate mitigation measures for protection of protected species on adjoining sites.
- Appropriate screening of all unsightly views and storage units. This should include early replanting of the hedgerow which was removed on the northern boundary of Oaklands Farm with Green Street, and the southern boundary with Binswood, and which should be done with mature, natural hedgerow species to provide early screening of the site.
- 12 months' notice of the dates of the event to allow local residents to plan their own events with confidence that they will not be disrupted through coinciding with the Jalsa Salana. (This has happened on several occasions with weddings and other important local events when the AMA have made late changes to the dates.)
- All the conditions specified in EHDC's Environmental Officer's response to the previous application, not included here.

Appendix 3: Financial Report 30th September 2019 – Quarter 2 to date

Annual Budget	Actual-Budget	RECEIPTS	(Exclusive of VAT) £	£
12170	6085	Precept	-	
6	31	Bank Interest	-	
0	0	VAT repayment	-	
500	185	Village Hall	-	
4	0	Wayleave	50.00	
0	0	S106	-	
4410	4391	Worldham Community Benefit Fund	-	
	590	Other income	-	
		TOTAL RECEIPTS		50.00
		PAYMENTS		
7,250	2402	Net Salaries & Allowances	1,388.70	
1000		Pension Contributions (e'ers & e'ees)	-	
120	0	Travel costs	-	
30	0	Chair's Allowance	-	
500	76	Stamps & Stationery	-	
		Equipment Purchase	7.95	
100	0	Section 137	-	
1,000	183	Repairs & maintenance	18.00	
700	669	Village Hall Electricity	176.80	
50	0	Village Hall Water Rates	-	
65	101	Inspections/Septic tank	-	
350	242	Subscriptions & Fees	-	
200	40	Audit fees	-	
600	700	Grant allocation	-	
150	0	Grass cutting	-	
675	69	Playground maintenance	-	
250	0	Training	-	
150	120	Election cost	119.60	
1090	1104	Insurance	1104.17	
0	616	VAT on payments	-	
14,280				
		TOTAL PAYMENTS		2,815.22
		BALANCE BROUGHT FORWARD on 30/06/2019		32,588.64
		ADD Total Receipts (as above)		50.00
		LESS Total payments (as above)		2,815.22
		Balance Carried forward 30/09/2019		29,823.42

These cumulative funds are represented by:

Current Account Balance	4,727.02
Less: Cheques drawn but not debited as at 15/08/19	486.00
Treasurers Account Balance	12,429.23
Worldham Community Benefit Fund	13,153.17
	29,823.42

Current status of S106 Developers Contributions held by SDNPA

Environmental	£1,098
Public open spaces	£2,657
Transport	£8,375

Appendix 4: Report on Church Lane Playground

30th September 2019

In late August 2019 a problem was noticed during a visual inspection of the playground in that a significant failure on the junior multiplay unit had occurred where 2 of the wooden platforms at either end had suffered what appeared to be water damage. The unit was immediately cordoned off and warning notices placed on it advising people not to use it.

The issue was reported to the manufacturer, Kompan, who recognised the fault and agreed to repair the unit under warranty.

This work was carried out on 20th September with an email being sent to me that day advising the following regarding 3 of the timbers and the roof forming part of the multiplay unit:

Closer site inspection it is clear to say the equipment has not been maintained monthly over the years as the unit has so much rot and growth

We have priced parts needed to be replaced as this is not a safe unit to play on with the amount of rot showing.

The roof and three large timbers for the bridge climber have severe rot.

Link to photos : <https://kompan.box.com/s/xkr6de3fs9a5a3xlw3jc8ofmb4sqvbi2>

A quotation was received from Kompan to carry out the repairs identified at a total cost of £3,854.33 plus VAT. The small roof section which makes up £1,790 of the quote does not necessarily need to be replaced so this would bring the price down to around £2,064 plus VAT (cost of fixings may reduce this further).

In the meantime, I contacted RoSPA who carried out the playground inspection in May 2019 as their report had not identified any issues with the multiplay unit and noted it as being 'low risk' with no remedial tasks necessary. They also didn't note any algae or decay on the unit. Interestingly, no other timbers on the multiplay unit are affected by algae or decay. I spoke to the inspector who carried out the inspection and she advised that robinia wood is a hard wood if it is cut at the right time, if cut too soon it can be a soft wood. In her opinion mature robinia wood is hard so decay is not common place.

Cllr Bagnell, who worked on the original playground installation, has looked at some documents supplied by Kompan at the time of ordering which say the following:

The environmentally friendly robinia wood has a high content of naturally occurring preservative tannic acid, which doesn't need to be treated in any way. At the same time, its dense composition makes it very resistant to splintering, humidity damage and water permeating the wood. All robinia products meet the EN1176 standard and are TUV and FSC certified.

I have also had the playground looked at by a local playground supplier who can repair the multiplay unit and remove the roof section at a cost of £1,250 plus VAT. At the same time they would also make the necessary adjustments to the swing heights noted in the May inspection report at no additional cost to us. If we can get Kompan to provide the timbers free of charge this supplier could install for us at a cost of £750 plus VAT. Kompan are likely to charge delivery costs of around £300 plus VAT.

I have spoken to our insurance company to advise them of what has happened and they have agreed that our actions to cordon off the unit and put up notices are sufficient. They strongly advised that we get another independent playground inspection carried out to confirm the state of the unit. They also advised that we can speak to their legal services if we wish to do so.

I have also spoken to the Play Inspection Company who could carry out a second independent inspection on our behalf. This would include an assessment of the life expectancy of the playground and is offered through a scheme by our insurers Came & Co. They have a scale of charges depending on our requirements as follows:

Urgent inspection within 2 weeks £295 + VAT

Inspection with 4-8 weeks £195 + VAT

Inspection within 8-12 weeks £65 + VAT

I have written to Kompan this week and sent them copies of the last 3 years playground inspection reports. I have asked that the timbers are replaced free of charge under warranty and await their response.

If we need to carry out repairs then quotations would need to come to the next PC meeting which is obviously a month away and the unit will have to stay closed in the meantime. I have received a call from the SDNPA this week regarding some outstanding S106 monies that need to be spent and require a project allocated to them by the end of the calendar year. There is £1,098 for environmental improvements and £2,657 for public open spaces. SDNPA will combine the two amounts and they could be used for the playground if you wished to replace an item but it cannot be used to repair existing items.

Jane Ives, Parish Clerk, 1st October 2019:

Appendix 5: HCC Footpath Diversion Consultation

Dear Sirs/Madam

PROPOSED DIVERSION OF PART OF WORLDHAM FOOTPATH NO.16B AND SELBORNE FOOTPATH 43

Hampshire County Council proposes to divert part of the above-named paths to facilitate the replacement of a footbridge. The bridge is on the Parish Boundary and it is therefore necessary to divert a small section of both routes, under section 119 of the Highways Act 1980. A plan showing the routes of the proposed diversion is attached.

Hampshire County Council has published a guidance document outlining the criteria that will be considered in assessing applications for extinguishments, either in the interest of the landowner or of the public. This document can be viewed on the HCC website at the following address and should be read in conjunction with the requirements of the Highways Act 1980. <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/row/making-changes/diversions.htm>

Definitive Alignment

Worldham - Part of Footpath No.16b commences at Point A on the plan (SU 7661 3514), proceeding south to a footbridge at the Parish Boundary, Point B (SU 7661 3513).

Selborne - Part of Footpath No.43 commences at a footbridge, at the Parish Boundary, Point B (SU 7661 3513), proceeding south-eastward to Point C (SU 7661 3512).

Approximately 18 metres in length.

Proposed Alignment

A 1.8 metre wide path, in the Parish of Worldham, commencing at Point A on the plan (SU 7661 3514), proceeding south-westward to a footbridge at the Parish Boundary, Point D (SU 7660 3512).

A 1.8 metre wide path, in the Parish of Selborne, commencing at footbridge at the Parish Boundary, Point D (SU 7660 3512), proceeding eastward to Point C (SU 7661 3512).

Approximately 34 metres in length.

Background

The original bridge was unsafe and has already been replaced. Due to the erosion of the bank the position of the bridge needed to be moved and therefore the legal line of the footpaths need to be diverted to accommodate the new bridge. Officers do not consider that the proposed alternative route will be substantially less convenient to the public.

If you have any comments to make and wish them to be considered by the Council, I would be grateful if written submissions could be sent to me at the email address above by the 4 October 2019, if possible. Should you wish to discuss any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

TaraPothecary

Tara Pothecary

Countryside Access Development Officer

Appendix 6: Jalsa Salana – EHDC Wash-Up Meeting 24th September 2019 Report

Due to the AMA representatives being unable to attend either the 9.30am Safety Advisory Meeting with council officers nor the 10.45am Local Engagement Meeting in person, having been delayed in traffic congestion, both meetings were conducted with them by conference call, all other attendees being present at Penns Place. There were a number of interruptions with the conference call due to loss of signal and poor reception, especially with Irfan Qureshi's phone, making it difficult to hear much of what he was saying. Cllr Becky Bagnell pointed out that the non-attendance of the AMA representatives was unsatisfactory. She worked full time and had taken time off to attend the meeting.

Present:

David Fitzgerald – EHDC Environmental Services Officer (Chairman)

Harriet Freeborn – (EHDC) Meeting Secretary

Andrew Wood – HCC Highways

Cllr Mark Kemp-Gee – HCC – Alton Rural

Cllr Roger Fletcher – Kingsley Parish Council

Cllr Becky Bagnell – Worldham Parish Council

Cllr Terry Blake – Worldham Parish Council

Farooq Mirza – AMA Representative (by conference call)

Irfan Qureshi – AMA Representative (by conference call)

FM gave a brief summary of the event. He said that overall it had gone well, helped by the good weather. In particular there had been no fire or H&S issues. 37,000 people attended the event, including volunteers. 6000 passes had been issued split between Country Market and Oaklands Farm. Road works on the A31 and A325 had caused some problems, otherwise traffic management had worked well.

FM was asked by DF what plans the AMA had for local consultation on the planning application. FM was rather non-committal, saying they would 'take a view' on the consultation, and whether it should be a joint parish consultation. RF said that Kingsley PC may have a public meeting, but a joint Parish meeting would be difficult in view of the numbers of people who might be expected to attend and finding a suitable venue. He said timing would be key in view of the short period of consultation.

TB said that WPC would be having a PC meeting on 2nd October and a decision would be made then on our consultation preference. He said it could depend on how different the application is from the previous one. WPC had held a public meeting following the previous application which had been very well attended and the issues had been very thoroughly debated. If there were not many differences in the latest application we would only be going over the same issues. His preference would be for a site meeting at Oaklands Farm between councillors and the AMA, at which we could see more precisely the impact of the development.

MK-G read out part of an email which he had received from Cllr David Ashcroft in which he expressed the view that the event had outgrown the site, although MK-G thought the numbers attending had not changed much over a number of years. It was pointed out that when the AMA first came they had said that they expected numbers attending to be in the order of 25,000. Since then they have grown to 37,700.

TB said that Worldham had experienced all the usual issues as previous years (summarised under the following topic headings).

Traffic: We reported that the traffic congestion on the side roads had been worse than ever this year, particularly on Wyck Lane and Blanket Street. TB quoted from Will Brock's comments on how his farming activities had been affected due to congestion on the event weekend, and that Andrew Aldridge had had to take on traffic control duty at the Wyck Lane/B3004 junction to sort out the chaos. MK-G commented that he had spoken to Richard Sykes of HCC Highways about what action would be taken to discourage use of these roads but had had no response. FM said that they had also raised it with Richard Sykes and the AA, the intention being that signs would be placed at the entrances to these roads and they would be marshalled. In the event this didn't happen. AW of HCC Highways had no comment on this – he didn't appear to be aware of anything that had happened previously. FM said that the only traffic issues he had been aware of this year was a request by a local resident in Oakhanger who had asked that the roads be kept clear for an event she was holding on the Sunday of the festival and he had sent two people down to keep the road clear. BB pointed out that at Boomtown all side roads are closed to event traffic and access is for residents only. Marshalls are placed at all access points to prevent unauthorised entry. She suggested that card passes could be issued to residents. DF asked AW whether road closures were feasible. He was unsure about this. He thought, even if notices were put up, it wouldn't be possible to stop people using the roads. It was recommended by all parish councillors that road closures be implemented next year for the 3 day period of the Jalsa on Wyck Lane,

Blanket Street and the Binsted to Kingsley road, with access for residents only. DF said he would ask his colleague who deals with Boomtown how they organised the local road closures.

Noise & Lighting: TB reported that there were the same issues as last year affecting the close neighbours, particularly at Tylings Cottages. They had complained about the bright lights at the western entrance to Oaklands Farm which were on all night and shone directly into their bedrooms. In addition, there had been noise of people shouting around 2-3am. When one of the residents had tried to ring the 24 hour helpline, there had been no answer. At the eastern end of the site, residents had suffered generator noise and light spill problems during the night, as previously. Reversing alarms had been in evidence again this year, throughout the set up and dismantling period. FM said that IQ had worked hard to make sure that contracts for mobile equipment on site stipulated that only white noise alarms should be fitted. Somehow this rogue cherry picker had slipped through the net.

Footpath: The footpath had again been blocked and diverted. FM and IQ said that this had been done in accordance with due process as an application had been submitted in advance. HCC Countryside Services had attended and had agreed that they could close the footpath for the 3 days of the event. TB said that he had been told a different story by HCC Countryside Services, that they had visited the site and considered the footpath posed a H&S risk to the public and had ordered the closure of the footpath for 3 days. In any case, even if the diversion were approved, they could not divert for more than 10 days. They were also reminded that it is a criminal offence to deliberately block a public footpath.

Water: TB reported that there had been problems with water supply during the early stage of the Jalsa with many residents in East Worldham having lost their water supply completely. Our PC Chairman, Andrew Aldridge, had phoned the water company and was told that they had no knowledge of the event and the demand on the main for increased water supply to Oakland Farm. They also had no knowledge of water being taken by tanker from a hydrant located next to the solar farm by the crossover with the A31 and the B3004. The water company had rectified the problem by increasing pressure on the line. The AMA were asked why they had not communicated the need for increased water supplies to the water company. IQ responded to this but due to poor line quality it was difficult to follow what he was saying. In essence it appears that the AMA had subcontracted the supply of water by tanker to a company and that it had all been properly organised. It was pointed out that the fact that water supplies to local residents had been interrupted for several years running during the event pointed to the fact that there was an issue and the AMA needed to communicate in advance with the water company to ensure it didn't happen in future.

Communication: TB said that the problem of no response on the helpline had occurred with some other people at other times. DF asked if we had a log of who and when for future reference, which we did not. He suggested that it would be useful to keep a log in future. The notice circulated by the AMA, giving details of emergency contact telephone nos etc had been late this year giving problems of getting the information circulated to residents. It was also pointed out that residents needed as much notice as possible of the dates of the Jalsa, at least 9-12 months so that people can make long term plans which avoid conflict with the Jalsa. There had been several instances where this had happened. FM said he was able to provide dates for 5 years ahead. He said he would give them to RF for him to circulate to other interested parties. DF said that it was important for the AMA to focus on these issues of communication.

Other Points: Following the withdrawal of FM and IQ from the conference call discussion, and the departures of AW and MK-G, the meeting continued on an informal basis and various points were discussed. BB pointed out that the Boomtown event has four of these Engagement Meetings compared with two for the Jalsa. Also, the organisers make a £6,000 donation to the local parish. It was suggested that the Jalsa Salana should be given the same level of treatment and regulatory oversight as Boomtown. DF agreed that in terms of numbers there were similarities between Boomtown and the Jalsa. However, the activities and issues on site were different.

DF suggested that we have another meeting in February together with the Safety Advisory Meeting. This seemed either to reflect the point BB had made, that more meetings might be desirable, or alternatively that this meeting had not been satisfactory due to the non-presence of the AMA representatives.