George Dyson
Town Clerk

☏ (01273) 585493
✉ TownClerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk

Community House,
Meridian Way,
Peacehaven,
East Sussex,
BN10 8BB.

17th November 2026

Members of Peacehaven Town Council are summoned to an EXTRAORDINARY Council meeting to be held in Community House, Peacehaven, on Monday 23rd November 2026 at 7.30pm.

George Dyson
Town Clerk

A G E N D A

C1624 MAYOR/CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS
C1625 PUBLIC SESSION. ***Members of the public may ask questions on any relevant Council matter.***
C1626 TO APPROVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
C1627 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS
C1628 TO ADOPT THE MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING OF THE 6TH OCTOBER 2026
C1629 TO DISCUSS AND AGREE ANY ACTIONS RELATING TO MAYORAL ATTENDANCE AT EVENTS
C1630 TO NOTE THE MOST RECENT LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION UPDATE
C1631 TO RECEIVE A REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY WORKING GROUP
C1632 TO AGREE AN INTERVIEW PANEL FOR THE CARETAKER VACANCY
C1633 DATE OF NEXT MEETING - TUESDAY 15TH DECEMBER 2026 AT 7.30PM.
C1634 TO RESOLVE TO EXCLUDE PRESS AND PUBLIC FROM THE FOLLOWING ITEMS

NOTE: In accordance with Standing Order No. 3(d) and the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, Section 1, in view of the confidential nature of the following business to be transacted, the public and press are excluded from the rest of the meeting.

C1635 TO RATIFY THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE INTERVIEW PANEL IN APPOINTING A FACILITIES MANAGER
C1636 TO AGREE A RESOLUTION TO A COMPLAINT
C1637 TO FORM A COMPLAINTS PANEL TO CONSIDER A COMPLAINT ABOUT A RECENT COUNCIL DECISION RELATING TO AN INCIDENT OF THE ALLOTMENTS

George Dyson
Town Clerk

☏ (01273) 585493
✉ TownClerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk

Community House,
Meridian Way,
Peacehaven,
East Sussex,
BN10 8BB.

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held in the Anzac Room, Community House on Tuesday 6th October 2026 at 7.30pm.

Town Councillors Present: Cllr Ian Alexander, Cllr Debbie Donovan, Cllr Nikki Fabry, Cllr Cathy Gallagher, Cllr Sue Griffiths, Cllr Amber Hart, Cllr Phil Mills, Cllr Max Rosser, Cllr Mary Campbell, Cllr Simon Studd, Cllr Claude Cheta, Cllr Isobel Sharkey.

Officers: George Dyson (Town Clerk), Kevin Bray (Parks Officer), Zoe Malone (Responsible Financial Officer) Zoe Polydorou (Meetings & Projects Officer).

Also Present: Cllr Stephen Chapman (ESCC), Cllr Tracy Pedro (ESCC), Daniel (Deputy Youth Mayor), Jacob (Youth Mayor).

There were 3 members of the public in attendance.

C1603 MAYOR/CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Cllr Donovan was asked to act as Chair for this meeting.

The Chair opened the meeting at 19:34, welcomed everyone, made a statement on Civility & Respect, briefly ran through the building fire procedures, asked that phones be put onto silent, advised that the meeting was being recorded, reminded everyone of the 3-minute speaking rule, and also explained how public participation take place in the meeting.

The statement provided by Cllr Harman was noted by Council, with our thoughts all being with her.

The Youth Mayor Chain was passed from Jacob to Daniel, for the remainder of the Civic Year during this meeting, with thanks to Jacob for his work.

C1604 PUBLIC SESSION. *Members of the public may ask questions on any relevant Council matter.*

a. Public Questions

A member of the public raised a concern about no hearing loop being available in the Anzac room. The member of the public then went on to explain that he was here to speak regarding an incident on the allotments, which is being considered at this meeting during item C1622.

Another member of the public, another allotment plot holder, also spoke with regard to the incident under C1622.

b. Updates from District & County Councillors

Cllr Gallagher spoke as a District Councillor, explaining that Local Government Reorganisation has been paused, that elections at Lewes District Council will be going ahead in May 2027, at the same time as the Town Council elections. It is currently unknown how long the pause on Local Government Reorganisation will be, at that it may not happen within this

Government. Devolution is pushing ahead though, with Mayoral election expected to happen by 2028.

The Lewes District Local Plan has also been paused, to allow policies to be tested against the new National Planning Policy Framework, which became law in August 2026. Lewes District has also taken on new Planning Officers.

£1.5m worth of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will also be put aside for works to the A259, although 85% of the total project costs will come from Government.

At the last Full Council meeting at Lewes District, the District Council restated their targets for carbon reduction and net-zero, with a number of agreed actions including working through the strategic authorities, lobbying for the Mayor of Sussex (when elected) to put environmental and climate matters into the heart of planning.

Cllr Alexander added that the District Council are also writing to the Government to seek advice on progressing with the Local Plan, and the implications of Local Government Reorganisation on this.

Cllr Fabry also added that a project in Telscombe to transform the Fairlight Toilets, and to develop Meridian Mayhem in Peacehaven have been delivered using CIL funding.

Cllr Chapman (ESCC) learned that the Morrisons development is going to Planning Committee tomorrow, but was surprised to see that the Library has been taken out of the proposal by Morrisons. The survey conducted to refurbish the existing library has been estimated at around £4m.

Cllr Chapman also highlighted concern about the upcoming Stand up to Racism Unity Festival, with concerns that they will be intimidating.

Cllr Pedro (ESCC) raised concerns about Havens Health not having had discussions with Morrisons with respect to the Meridian Centre redevelopment.

C1605 TO APPROVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs Harman, Veck, Davies, Gordon-Garrett, and Wood.

C1606 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Cllr Campbell declared an interest under item C1609.

C1607 TO ADOPT THE MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING OF THE 7TH JULY 2026

Proposed by: Cllr Mills **Seconded by:** Cllr Griffiths
The minutes of 7th July 2026 were **agreed** and **adopted**.

3 members of the Public and the ESCC Councillors left at this point (20:05).

C1608 TO RECEIVE MINUTES, RATIFY ACTIONS & RECEIVE REPORTS ON URGENT MATTERS:-

a. **Planning Committee:-**

i. **To receive the meeting minutes of the 30th June 2026**
ii. **To receive the meeting minutes of the 21st July 2026**
iii. **To receive the meeting minutes of the 11th August 2026**
iv. **To receive the meeting minutes of the 1st September 2026**

Proposed by: Cllr Campell **Seconded by:** Cllr Mills
The meeting minutes were **agreed** and **adopted**.
Cllr Campbell explained that she has put herself forward as the vice-chair of planning to speak at the Lewes District Planning meeting tomorrow, with particular concern about cycle routes being included.

The Town Clerk explained that Council are asked to decide whether to agree that Cllr Campbell is authorised to speak on behalf of the Town Council or not at the Lewes District Planning meeting tomorrow.

Cllr Fabry raised a concern that this matter needs to be kept simple and not complicated by additional comments.

Cllr Gallagher also raised a concern that the focus should be on the Officer's report, which includes the agreed Peacehaven Town Council comments, and that this is just stage one, and that further work can be agreed in the future.

Cllr Campbell explained that she put in to speak, subject to this meeting, and that there was a deadline for a representative to be put forward. Cllr Campbell raised a concern that there have been some issues overlooked relating to cycle routes.

Cllr Rosser explained that he would be happy for Cllr Campbell to represent the Town Council, that respect is very important, and that there is value in speaking at the meeting tomorrow.

Cllr Campbell explained that she is withdrawing from representing the Town Council at the meeting tomorrow, but may still speak as an individual resident if possible.

v. **To note the draft meeting minutes of the 22nd September 2026**

The draft meeting minutes were **noted**.

b. **Policy & Finance Committee:-**

i. **To receive the financial report, authorise payments and signing of Bank Reconciliation statements**

Proposed by: Cllr Alexander **Seconded by:** Cllr Griffiths
Council **resolved** to **agree** the financial report, to authorise payments and signing of bank reconciliation statements.

ii. **To receive the meeting minutes of the 23rd June 2026**

Proposed by: Cllr Alexander **Seconded by:** Cllr Fabry
The meeting minutes were **agreed** and **adopted**.

iii. **To note the draft meeting minutes of the 15th September 2026**

The draft meeting minutes were **noted**.

c. **Personnel Committee:-**

i. **To receive the meeting minutes of the 14th April 2026**

Proposed by: Cllr Fabry **Seconded by:** Cllr Alexander
The meeting minutes were **agreed** and **adopted**.

ii. **To note the draft meeting minutes of 22nd September 2026**

The draft meeting minutes were **noted**.

d. **Leisure & Amenities Committee;-**

i. **To receive the meeting minutes of the 19th May 2026**
ii. **To receive the meeting minutes of the 14th July 2026**

Proposed by: Cllr Gallagher **Seconded by:** Cllr Donovan
The meeting minutes were **agreed** and **adopted**.

iii. **To note the draft meeting minutes of the 8th September 2026**

The draft meeting minutes were **noted**.

e. **Community Engagement Committee:-**

i. **To receive the meeting minutes of the 2nd June 2026**

Proposed by: Cllr Rosser **Seconded by:** Cllr Mills
The meeting minutes were **agreed** and **adopted**.

ii. **To note the draft meeting minutes of the 28th July 2026**

The draft meeting minutes were **noted**.

f. **Environment & Sustainability Committee:-**

i. **To note the draft meeting minutes of the 30th June 2026**

The draft meeting minutes were **noted**.

Cllr Campbell left the meeting at this point.

C1609 TO AGREE A RESPONSE TO EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL WITH REGARDS TO PEACEHAVEN LIBRARY

The Chair read out the report recommendations. Cllr Gallagher queried the purpose of the report, which Cllr Hart explained was in response to the ESCC library service comments with respect to wanting to reduce the size of the library. Cllr Alexander and Cllr Griffiths spoke in support of the proposed response, and that a banking hub could also be provided in the library.

It was proposed that the response be agreed and set as read.

Proposed by: Cllr Gallagher **Seconded by:** Cllr Griffiths
Council **resolved** to **agree** to this proposal.

Cllr Campbell returned to the meeting at this time.

Cllr Gallagher explained that Telscombe Town Council have received a response to a similar letter that they sent, essentially explaining that Morrisons have not engaged with ESCC on the library matter at this stage.

C1610 TO AGREE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY COHESION TFG

Cllr Gallagher gave some background to the work of the TFG, and that the first piece of work was to agree the wording for a declaration of Community Cohesion, which is now included as a recommendation in this paper, that the declaration will be signed by the Chair and Clerk, which actions can then be drawn out from.

It was proposed that the recommendation in the report be agreed

Proposed by: Cllr Sharkey **Seconded by:** Cllr Hart.
Council **resolved** to **agree** to this proposal.

C1611 TO DISCUSS AND AGREE ACTIONS ON BUDGETING FOR BUS SHELTER REPLACEMENTS

The RFO introduced the report and summarised the reason for it coming to Council.

Cllr Mills questioned the condition of the current bus shelters, which the RFO explained was in the report. Cllr Studd queried the annual cost of bus shelter maintenance currently.

Cllr Gallagher spoke in support of the recommendation.

It was proposed that Council agree to put money in the budget for bus shelters, the figure to be agreed as part of the budget setting process.

Proposed by: Cllr Gallagher **Seconded by:** Cllr Cheta

Council **resolved** to **agree** to this proposal.

C1612 TO AGREE A SPECIFICATION FOR THE FIELDS & ROBSON ROOF

The RFO introduced the report and the work that the Community Buildings Working Group has been doing on this item.

Cllr Griffiths spoke in support of the recommendation to undertake a structural survey of the room to establish whether a Green Roof is possible.

Cllr Sharkey agreed that it's especially important to explore options to add biodiversity. Cllr Campbell also raised a query about the type of Green roof we would consider. Cllr Alexander added that it seems a good way to find out the feasibility of this sort of roof.

Cllr Gallagher left at this point

It was proposed that Council agree to undertake a structural survey for the suitability of a sedum roof.

Proposed by: Cllr Griffiths **Seconded by:** Cllr Studd
Council **resolved** to **agree** to this proposal.

C1613 TO AGREE JOINT MEETINGS WITH TELSCOMBE TOWN COUNCIL

The Meetings & Projects Officer explained to Council the background to this item and how it has come about.

Cllr Gallagher returned to the room at this point

Cllr Fabry spoke in support of the proposed joint meetings. Cllr Griffiths asked that the meetings not be scheduled, but take place ad-hoc when there are items that are necessary to discuss.

Cllr Gallagher spoke in support of the meetings taking place, and that there are significant benefits in these meetings taking place.

It was proposed that Council agree to proceed with the joint meetings.

Proposed by: Cllr Mills **Seconded by:** Cllr Rosser
Council **resolved** to **agree** to this proposal.

Cllr Rosser, Cllr Alexander, and Cllr Hart will form the Councillors representing Peacehaven Town Council at these meetings.

C1614 TO CONSIDER ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF POLITICAL NEUTRALITY

The Clerk summarised the report and explained the purpose of the statement included in the papers.

Cllr Fabry highlighted that Councillors run for a party, or as an independent Councillor, on the ballot sheet, and that Councillors would feel lost without their affiliation.

Cllr Gallagher raised a concern that Town Councils are political, and that she finds the policy conflicts with her views as a member of the Labour party. Cllr Gallagher explained that she has sent a copy of this proposed policy to the Meridian Labour Group for comment, and that they explained that the sentiment was alright, but that some elements needed amendment.

Cllr Sharkey raised concerns about the statement essentially meaning that candidates could not stand as a party member at election.

Cllr Griffiths spoke in support of the statement, and has seen party-politics cause problems at this Council in the past and finds that the statement is exactly what she feels a Town Council should be.

The Youth Mayor left at this point.

Cllr Campbell spoke that each issue should be treated on its merits, and not have to vote a particular way due to the position of a political party. The party-political situation has become more extreme and divisive, which we should not want to affect the Town Council, and that encouraging people to serve their community may be aided by a statement such as this.

Cllr Fabry spoke about some of the benefits of having political-parties represented at the Town Council, and highlighted that party-membership should be reflected on the Town Council website and on the Councillor boards in the Foyer.

The statement will go back to the Town Clerk to consult with Cllr Mills, Rosser, Gallagher, Griffiths, and Fabry.

C1615 TO REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND AGREE ANY CHANGES

The Clerk advised that Cllr Wood would like to come off the Planning Committee. Cllr Sharkey and Cllr Gallagher advised that they would be happy to substitute at Planning meetings for absent Councillors.

C1616 TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM OUTSIDE BODY REPRESENTATIVES AND REVIEW OUTSIDE BODY REPRESENTATION

Council **noted** the outside body representation reports.

C1617 TO NOTE OVERVIEW OF COMPLAINTS RECEIVED

Council **noted** the overview of complaints received.

C1618 TO NOTE THE COUNCILLOR ATTENDANCE RECORD

Council **noted** the Councillor attendance record.

C1619 TO RECEIVE VERBAL UPDATES FROM THE FOLLOWING TASK AND FINISH GROUPS (TFGs):

a. Meridian Centre Liaison

No update on this item.

b. Public Rights of Way

There is a written report which will be circulated.

c. Public Safety

Cllr Alexander highlighted that due to a change in how Sussex Police work, it has become more difficult to get police representation.

Speedwatch is still going, but it's got to the time of year where times are more limited for Speedwatch to take place.

d. Sussex Nature Recovery

Cllr Campbell advised that the TFG members have completed some training, and that a report will be going to the upcoming Environment and Sustainability Committee meeting.

e. Neighbourhood Plan Amendments

The TFG has met, and needs to have another meeting soon, to include the Town Clerk, to finalise the proposals.

f. Mayors Handbook Review

Cllr Gallagher asked to withdraw from this TFG. The TFG is yet to meet. Cllr Mills will join this TFG, the Meetings & Projects Officer will arrange a meeting soon.

g. Youth Engagement

No update on this TFG.

C1620 DATE OF NEXT MEETING - TUESDAY 15TH DECEMBER 2026 AT 7.30PM.

The next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 15th December 2026.

C1621 TO RESOLVE TO EXCLUDE PRESS AND PUBLIC FROM THE FOLLOWING ITEMS

Proposed by: Cllr Alexander **Seconded by:** Cllr Sharkey
Council **resolved** to **exclude** press and public from the remaining agenda items.

NOTE: In accordance with Standing Order No. 3(d) and the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, Section 1, in view of the confidential nature of the following business to be transacted, the public and press are excluded from the rest of the meeting.

C1622 TO AGREE ACTIONS RELATING TO AN INCIDENT ON THE ALLOTMENTS

Councillors asked some questions of clarification to the Parks Officer regarding the confidential report, which the Parks Officer answered.

The Parks Officer left at this point.

Cllr Campbell left at this point

After a lengthy discussion, it was proposed that a formal and final warning be given verbally and followed up in writing to the plot holder, and that we also explore options for mediation, and a possible plot move to a more suitable location.

Proposed by: Cllr Fabry **Seconded by:** Cllr Donovan
Council **resolved** to **agree** to this proposal.

C1623 TO AGREE ACTIONS RELATING TO UPCOMING STAFF RECRUITMENT NEEDS

Cllr Fabry introduced the item and spoke in support of the recommendation in the confidential report.

There was a brief discussion on the proposed job title, description, and salary point.

It was proposed that Council agree to commence an internal recruitment process to appoint a facilities manager.

Proposed by: Cllr Mills **Seconded by:** Cllr Fabry
Council **resolved** to **agree** to this proposal.

There being no further business, the meeting was closed at 22:24.

George Dyson
Town Clerk

☎ (01273) 585493
✉ TownClerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk

Community House,
Meridian Way,
Peacehaven,
East Sussex,
BN10 8BB.

Committee:	Full Council	**Agenda Item:**	C1629
Meeting date:	23rd November 2026	**Authors:**	Cllr I Alexander, Chair P&F
Subject:	Mayoral Attendance at Events		
Purpose:	To clarify the current arrangements for Mayoral attendance at events following an invitation		

Recommendation(s):

1. Council to continue with the protocol as written in the Mayors Handbook.
2. Amend the protocol to cover periods of illness or other unavoidable long-term absences

1. **Background**. The Mayor is the Chair of the Council and as such is the First Citizen of the Town of Peacehaven. The Mayor is the ambassador of the town and can help in the promotion of the council's objectives in the local community**.** The Mayor's Handbook contains the protocol for Mayoral attendance at events within and outside Peacehaven Town Council area. Details of the process to be followed are also stated in the Mayoral Handbook. For the avoidance of any doubt, under the current Mayor's Handbook only the Mayor or the Deputy Mayor are allowed to attend invitations sent for Mayoral attendance. The Mayor may be accompanied by a Consort of their choice, but the Consort cannot attend on their own, neither can a Councillor attend as deputy for the Mayor or Deputy Mayor.

2. **Options for Council.** The Council have the power to change the arrangements but must, wherever possible, maintain the current convention on protocol.

3. **Reason for recommendation.** Due to the unfortunate absence of both Mayor and Civic Officer at the same time, a number of different arrangements have been made, which are outside the current guidance and protocol.

4. **Expected benefits.** It is important that the role and duties of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor are carried out in a manner that continues to support their role as First Citizen and follows the required protocol .

Implications

5.1 Legal	
5.2 Risks	
5.3 Financial	
5.4 Time scales	
5.5 Stakeholders & Social Value	
5.6 Contracts	
5.7 Climate & Sustainability	
5.8 Crime & Disorder	
5.9 Health & Safety	
5.10 Biodiversity	
5.11 Privacy Impact	
5.12 Equality & Diversity	

5. Values & priorities alignment

Which of the Core Values does the recommendation demonstrate?	
6.1 Empowering and supporting the community	☐
6.2 Growing the economy sustainably	☐
6.3 Helping children and young people	☐
6.4 Improving the quality of life for residents and visitors to Peacehaven	☐
6.5 Supporting residents in need	☐
6.6 Valuing the environment	☐

6.7 Which business plan item(s) does the recommendation relate to?

6. Appendices

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government

Jim McMahon OBE MP
Minister for Local Government, Devolution and Regional Growth
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Council Leaders
East Sussex and Brighton and Hove
By email

29 October 2026

Dear Leaders,

I am writing to set out the outcome of the Government's review of the framework for the local government reorganisation programme and, separately, my current provisional view on the proposals for local government reorganisation in East Sussex and Brighton and Hove. I am grateful for all the work that went into developing proposals and preparing for implementation, and for the patience you have shown throughout this process. I recognise that the review period has not been easy, and do not take for granted your continued commitment to the long-term work needed to fix the foundations and put local government in the best possible position.

Outcome of the programme review

Following the announcement to Parliament on 7 September 2026, the Secretary of State and I have worked with officials to interrogate the key pillars and framework underpinning the Local Government Reorganisation programme, including asking whether the existing unweighted criteria ('the criteria') set in February 2025 and the programme's objectives continue to support the policy priorities of the new Government.

We have concluded that the basis of the programme is robust and that the existing criteria against which proposals have been submitted were correct on their own terms and continue to support the Government's policy agenda. Following this initial phase of the review, we can therefore confirm that the Government remains committed to delivering local government reorganisation and that we will continue to move forward with the programme based on the existing criteria, which we hope gives confidence as the programme progresses.

Minded to decision for East Sussex and Brighton and Hove

The Secretary of State has recused herself from decision making in respect of local government reorganisation in the East Sussex and Brighton and Hove invitation area.

Separately from the programme-level review, in my capacity as Minister for Local Government, Devolution and Regional Growth, I am currently minded to implement the **proposal submitted by Eastbourne Borough Council, East Sussex County Council, Hastings Borough Council, Lewes District Council and Rother District Council with modifications to the proposed boundary to expand Brighton and Hove by four wards.**

That proposal, together with the modifications that I am currently minded to make, would establish the following new councils, **with elections in May 2028, ahead of vesting in April 2029**:

Proposed new council	**Existing local government areas forming proposed new council** (excluding county council)	**Current population**
East Sussex Council	Eastbourne Borough Council Hastings Borough Council Lewes District Council minus four wards (East Saltdean and Telscombe Cliffs, Peacehaven North, Peacehaven East and Peacehaven West) Rother District Council Wealden District Council	537,000
Brighton and Hove Council	Brighton and Hove City Council plus four wards from Lewes District Council (East Saltdean and Telscombe Cliffs, Peacehaven North, Peacehaven East and Peacehaven West)	308,000

Consideration of the proposals

This letter sets out my consideration of the performance of each proposal against the criteria and the reasons why I am currently minded to select the preferred proposal. Where relevant, the letter also sets out areas where further information is sought to assist with reaching a final decision. Further detail of the minded to process is set out at the end of this letter.

I have considered the proposals and options received from councils in East Sussex and Brighton and Hove:

- **Two unitary proposal submitted by East Sussex County Council, Eastbourne Borough Council, Hastings Borough Council, Lewes District Council, Rother District Council (‘original two unitary’)**
- **Five unitary proposal on a pan Sussex basis submitted by Brighton and Hove City Council (‘five unitary’)**
- **Two unitary modification as requested by Brighton and Hove (‘modified two unitary’)** to reduce East Sussex Council by four wards and one parish with the corresponding increase to Brighton and Hove.

I have assessed each submitted proposal and option against the six criteria and considered their strengths and weaknesses before reaching this minded to decision.

The original two unitary proposal and modified two unitary option meet all six criteria shared on 5 February 2025 and offer potential benefits for establishing single tier local government. The five unitary proposal does not meet criteria 2, 3 and 4. Principally this is because of the cost implications of implementing the proposal and concerns regarding the financial sustainability of the proposed new councils (criterion 2), potential disruption to public services due to the scale of change and subsequent risk to service users (criterion 3), and that the proposal was developed in isolation from other councils in the areas concerned (criterion 4). Our decision therefore turns principally on the comparative position of the original and modified two unitary options and on whether I believe the boundary change has the strong public services and financial sustainability related justification set out in the published guidance.

Criterion 1: A proposal should seek to achieve for the whole of the area concerned the establishment of a single tier of local government

The modified two unitary option meets criterion 1. It would establish a single tier of local government across the whole invitation area and create councils with populations of approximately 537,000 for East

Sussex and 308,000 for an expanded Brighton and Hove. The four wards (East Saltdean and Telscombe Cliffs, Peacehaven North, Peacehaven East and Peacehaven West) have identified employment, travel to work, transport and service use connections with Brighton and Hove and the modification builds on this. While requested by Brighton and Hove, I have decided to omit Falmer Parish, with a population of around 300, from the modification. This is due to its predominantly rural identity, to go some way to mitigating the complexities of implementation and follows consideration of consultation responses.

I am satisfied that the modification provides for a sensible economic area and better represents a functional urban area and geography. Brighton and Hove is currently constrained by the challenges of an under-bounded geography. The modification would bring responsibility for housing, regeneration, transport, infrastructure and local services together across communities with established functional links. I recognise that the boundary changes outlined for Brighton and Hove would provide only a modest expansion and could mean that Brighton and Hove would remain relatively under-bounded; that the coast and South Downs National Park constrain development; and that the evidence does not establish that the change would resolve the city's housing constraints in full. But I consider that the boundary changes will result in positive impacts by seeking to expand Brighton and Hove, allowing the council to consider, plan and implement infrastructure requirements along the A259 corridor, and its connected coastal communities for example. I am confident that the residual East Sussex area will still be able to pursue the significant economic growth opportunities available in the area, such as Newhaven's industrial, logistics and maritime activity.

I have concluded that the modified geography provides a better overall alignment for the transferred coastal communities and a broader basis for coordinated planning around Brighton and Hove, and that this smaller expansion would be a positive move towards establishing a stronger, more coherent Brighton and Hove Council. I consider those factors to weigh in favour of the modified option over the original two unitary proposal. While the modification is relatively modest in scale, I am satisfied that it nevertheless offers the benefits identified above.

Turning to the other proposals, the original two unitary proposal would establish a single East Sussex authority on the existing county footprint, preserving this East Sussex geography, avoiding dividing Lewes District and providing a coherent basis for strategic planning across East Sussex. But it does not seek to address Brighton and Hove's boundary, with Brighton and Hove remaining on its current footprint, which I regard as restrictive for the reasons outlined above.

The five unitary proposal would create five authorities on a pan-Sussex basis (going beyond the East Sussex and Brighton and Hove invitation area). The scale of boundary change, including a proposed authority that would cross current East and West Sussex county boundaries, would also make the proposed geography more complex to implement.

Criterion 2: Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks

The modified two unitary option meets criterion 2 and creates two councils with populations of approximately 537,000 for East Sussex and 308,000 for an expanded Brighton and Hove, transferring four wards (East Saltdean and Telscombe Cliffs, Peacehaven North, Peacehaven East and Peacehaven West) from Lewes District.

I acknowledge that the population of the expanded Brighton and Hove would be below the 500,000 guiding principle and will set out why I believe the case is made for it. The guiding principle of 500,000 is not a fixed threshold, and I made clear that councils across the programme could develop proposals for authorities with populations either above or below that figure in statements to Parliament and in discussions with the sector over many months. In this case, flexibility is justified by the different

characteristics and needs of the two areas and by the benefits of councils with a clearer local focus on issues impacting these areas; such as accessible services and infrastructure in rural areas, housing affordability and job opportunities in urban areas and better access to health and social care services and coastal defence in coastal communities. It is also relevant that many single-tier councils, with a median population of 275,000, have operated effectively across the same key services for decades. The modification brings the expanded Brighton and Hove closer to the guiding principle of a population of 500,000; each council would have a strong population base to support long-term sustainability and growth, while responding more closely to its area's needs.

I have distinguished projected efficiencies from longer term financial sustainability. The original two unitary option has the more complete efficiency evidence, including forecast efficiencies. It is reasonable to expect that the two-unitary modified option could deliver efficiencies of a similar scale, even if early implementation costs are higher.

The sustainability assessment is more finely balanced. Analysis conducted by MHCLG officials found little difference between the original and modified two unitary options, with both expected to perform similarly or better than their existing council arrangements. However, I have considered that the modification would increase Brighton and Hove's population and broaden the tax base, while acknowledging that it would correspondingly reduce that of East Sussex. Given the modest boundary change proposed, I consider that the residual East Sussex remains of sufficient scale to absorb the impacts of the boundary change and the departmental assessment is that it would continue to potentially perform similarly or better than the existing structure.

I recognise that the modification will not resolve Brighton and Hove's financial challenges in full and that the sustainability assessment for the modified option shows only a likely marginal gain. However, I judge that the modified option has better potential to further improve the long-term sustainability of the expanded Brighton and Hove authority for two key reasons.

First, as set out under criterion 1, I consider that this has the potential to better support Brighton's economic and housing growth, with the potential for housing, planning, transport and investment along the coastal corridor to be coordinated within one authority. I consider this provides a better platform and opportunity to support investment and growth in Brighton and Hove; more economic and housing growth has the potential to provide positive knock-on impacts for the long-term tax base and sustainability prospects of the area. Second, I consider that the modified option offers the potential to improve public service coherence, access and accountability across communities with identified connections to Brighton and Hove.

It is also important to say that while reorganisation can contribute to local government sustainability, it is only part of the answer alongside work across government and the sector on public sector reform and high-cost demand-led services in adult social care, children's services, SEND and temporary accommodation, for example. Much of that work is underway and supported by new investment alongside a focus on early intervention and prevention. Critical to success will be strong leadership, sufficient capacity and capability, and clear prioritisation of resources to support the transition and ensure high performance of these services going forward. I am confident that the support offer put in place by government can develop a credible pathway to securing new and effective leadership candidates where required, across statutory services such as adult social care, children's services and public health within the new authorities.

Taking these together, and alongside the marginal improvement in the sustainability assessment, I judge that the modified option provides a better platform for the councils across the area to be more sustainable in the long term.

Turning to the other proposals, the original two unitary proposal would retain the existing East Sussex county footprint and avoid disaggregating countywide services, which by its nature would involve lower transition costs. As the original two unitary proposal acknowledges, local government reorganisation alone will not resolve the financial pressures that councils in East Sussex face, nor does it address the financial pressures affecting Brighton and Hove.

The five unitary proposal does not meet the criterion. It would create five councils with reduced capacity to absorb financial shocks. Overall, the proposal does not represent a clear improvement on current structures in terms of our sustainability assessment, while implementation costs and disaggregation risks are substantially greater.

Criterion 3: Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens

The modified two unitary option meets criterion 3. It would bring housing, planning, transport, public realm and local services for the transferred communities within one authority. These responsibilities would align more closely with how residents travel, use services and access Brighton and Hove.

I judge that the options for two authorities will enable effective, high-quality services for local residents and that the modification will help align service provision and planning in a way that better reflects the urban extent of Brighton and Hove along the coastal corridor. This would enable an expanded Brighton and Hove council to better reflect its local communities and therefore be better able to design and target public services in line with those needs.

Alongside the support we are providing to manage the division of services, Brighton and Hove also set out local measures to mitigate the challenges to services during transition. These include preserving existing service arrangements until transfers are safe, phased implementation and dual running where required, shared data between authorities where possible, transition arrangements established within the Structural Changes Order, TUPE transfer of the workforce and safeguarding protocols.

With these measures and national support, and given the modest nature of the boundary changes, I judge that the public service benefits of the modification outweigh the risks outlined in the boundary change section below. I have considered representations from local service providers, including the police and health bodies, and from other government departments. I acknowledge that the transition creates a challenge to service provision and will require detailed arrangements to manage it. I have nevertheless concluded that the potential to plan and deliver public services together across more connected communities, alongside the planning and financial sustainability factors, is sufficient to justify accepting the additional transition risk that comes with the modest changes. I am of the view that not including Falmer parish within an expanded Brighton and Hove will go some way to mitigating the complexities of implementing the modification.

The department has worked with other government departments to develop a robust support offer comprising several elements. Funding will enable each area undergoing transition to bring in additional capacity to support a safe process. National work to develop future directors of health and social care services will help ensure that, in the medium term, there are enough suitably qualified leaders to deliver effective and safe services. Although the councils will be statutorily constituted as separate bodies, they do not need to operate as completely separate organisations from day one. The department will support authorities seeking a longer transition period to manage this effectively.

Taken together, the funding and wider support offer gives me confidence that the identified risks to public services during transition and the division of services can be managed if implementation is handled well. This is the first time government has provided funding support in this way. The recent experience of disaggregating statutory services following local government reorganisation in Cumbria

provides further reassurance: well-planned and supported disaggregation can strengthen local accountability and improve services, and children's services continued to improve following reorganisation. I consider that close working between government and local councils throughout transition can also help manage the concerns about the effect on Brighton and Hove's adult social care improvement.

Turning to the other proposals, I recognise that a judgement against an individual criterion can be finely balanced, and the original two unitary proposal carries less transition risk for public services. As it uses existing councils as building blocks it would avoid the complexities of disaggregating services at ward level and preserve established upper-tier service areas and partnerships within the area. East Sussex adult social care, children's services, SEND, public health, safeguarding and other countywide functions would remain within one authority. Brighton and Hove would continue to deliver its existing unitary services. However, it does not seek to connect communities across the coastal corridor in the same way as the modified option.

The five unitary proposal does not meet the criterion. As the proposal was across local government reorganisation invitation area boundaries, this would require particularly complex disaggregation and aggregation of services provided by existing upper tier authorities. Due to these specific complexities, the proposal is anticipated to involve substantial implementation costs and may present risks to service continuity. As departmental analysis has assessed the proposed five new authorities to be potentially less financially resilient than the existing structures, there is a resulting risk that the new authorities may not have the ability to deliver high-quality and sustainable public services to residents within the areas concerned.

Criterion 4: Proposals should show how councils in the area have sought to work together in coming to a view that meets local needs and is informed by local views

The modified two unitary option meets criterion 4. I have considered the views expressed in the consultation responses and appreciate the strength of concern regarding local identity. I have carefully considered those views as part of making a rounded judgement, as evidenced by my decision to omit Falmer parish from an expanded Brighton and Hove due its rural identity, to reduce the complexity associated with boundary change and having considered the representations made. As set out under criterion 6, credible neighbourhood governance and continuing engagement with residents by the new expanded Brighton and Hove council will be essential to make sure that the new council is set up for success and remains sensitive to the needs and views of those local communities.

Turning to the other proposals, the original two unitary proposal was developed by East Sussex County Council, Eastbourne Borough Council, Hastings Borough Council, Lewes District Council and Rother District Council. It meets criterion 4 and demonstrates strong collaboration among the East Sussex councils and attracted comparatively strong support during both consultations. Wealden District Council did not submit or formally support the proposal.

The five unitary proposal was developed independently and did not secure support from other councils in the East Sussex or West Sussex invitation areas and did not meet this criterion. Engagement on the proposal and its boundary changes was limited. Analysis of consultation responses found limited support for the proposal from both residents and service delivery partners across the two invitation areas: East Sussex and Brighton and Hove, and West Sussex.

Criterion 5: New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements

The modified two unitary option meets criterion 5. The Strategic Authority holds important levers for transport, housing, regeneration and economic growth across the wider area. While a reorganisation decision is still to be made in West Sussex, in the context of the Strategic Authority, the modified two

unitary would provide for two relatively more balanced partners in East Sussex and Brighton and Hove in terms of population.

Turning to the other proposals, the original two unitary proposal would retain existing authority boundaries and involve less work in the transition period. It would, however, leave a greater difference in population between East Sussex and Brighton and Hove. While I would not expect reorganisation to achieve complete equalisation of population for all new unitaries, I judge there is a clear advantage in expanding Brighton and Hove beyond its current base alongside the other advantages.

The five unitary proposal would provide a larger number of constituent councils and potentially more balanced individual representation across different places, which is a clear benefit of this proposal. It may also create more complex governance arrangements but, on balance, I felt that the five unitary proposal had some merit against this criterion.

Criterion 6: New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment

The modified two unitary option meets criterion 6. Communities within this coastal corridor may benefit from direct engagement with an expanded Brighton and Hove council, which would be better placed to respond to similar coastal challenges across the area. I acknowledge concerns from affected communities about their sense of local identity. But I am clear that, while appreciating the concerns expressed, strong opposition does not mean that effective arrangements cannot be established; rather it increases the importance of establishing them in an effective and meaningful manner.

I consider that the evidence does not explain in comparable detail how the transferred communities would be integrated or how their identity and influence would be protected. I would like more detail to be provided on how communities will be integrated into an expanded Brighton and Hove and how their local identities will be valued and embraced as part of the representations made during the ‘minded to’ process.

Turning to the other proposals, the original two unitary proposal would create an East Sussex authority covering coastal, rural and urban communities. Consultation responses highlighted a risk that this council could appear more remote. This is not always the case in practice, providing that the varied and diverse local identities, history and character are valued and built upon. The proposal seeks to address this through parish councils and other neighbourhood governance arrangements.

The five unitary proposal meets this criterion and places greater emphasis on smaller councils that are closer to residents, using existing town and parish councils, neighbourhood charters and local access points.

It is important to note that the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Act 2026 requires all councils in England to make appropriate arrangements for effective neighbourhood governance in neighbourhood areas, with the Secretary of State able to make further provisions on those arrangements through regulations. Local government reorganisation provides an opportunity to embed this approach from the outset. Effective neighbourhood governance can help ensure that, within larger unitary structures, communities retain a strong local voice, are able to influence decisions affecting their area, and see their distinct identities and priorities reflected in how the new councils operate. We will publish a Neighbourhood Governance Framework later this year, which will provide new councils with some high-level principles to consider.

Boundary change justification

The published guidance states that existing district areas should ordinarily be the building blocks for proposals and that more complex boundary changes require a strong public services and financial sustainability related justification.

Following careful consideration, in my view, the boundary change required for the selected option is justified.

In my judgement, the principal justification for the boundary change comes from the public service benefits this would provide. This includes the potential for housing, planning, transport, investment and growth, and statutory public services along the coastal corridor to be coordinated within one authority, offering the potential to improve service coherence, access and accountability across communities with identified connections to Brighton and Hove. Following consideration of the representations made, I have decided to omit Falmer parish from an expanded Brighton and Hove based on its rural identity, to reduce the complexity associated with implementing the modification and having considered the representations made. I recognise that there is a residual impact on East Sussex resulting from the boundary change. However, I am confident that the new East Sussex council will also be able to plan and deliver services in a coherent manner that reflects the diverse nature of the communities that it will serve across rural, coastal and urban areas.

I have considered whether the boundary changes could disproportionately affect residents aged 65 and over in the remaining East Sussex area given the relatively older population. Our modelling indicates marginal improvements in financial sustainability compared with the existing county council, which will then provide a better platform for sustainable public service delivery, while bringing housing, public health and adult social care together offers opportunities to better coordinate support and public services around all resident's needs, including older residents. These benefits do not remove the transition risks, but I have confidence that the funding and leadership support described above provides a basis for managing these transition risks, and I would expect that the new authorities put in place specific monitoring of the effects on all residents, including older residents, as they move to implement decisions.

These place-based and strategic benefits lead me to judge that public service delivery will be improved over the long term. In turn, I am confident that stronger public service delivery also has the potential to improve financial sustainability over the longer term through more efficient services, better outcomes for residents, and reduced demand and expenditure overall.

I recognise that, in the short term, the modification creates additional transition challenges for adult social care, children’s services, SEND, safeguarding and established partnerships. As I have set out above, under criterion 3, I also consider that these short-term risks can be effectively managed through the funding and support packages available, which underpins the strength of the overall justification in relation to public services. I consider that the long-term benefits that flow from enabling housing, regeneration, transport, public realm and local services issues to be considered more coherently by councils that represent communities that already function together outweigh the short-term transition risks.

The assessed financial sustainability benefits of the boundary change, as set out under criterion 2, begin with a marginal but positive improvement in the sustainability assessment. Beyond that marginal gain, bringing housing, planning, transport and investment along the coastal corridor within one authority offers greater potential to support economic and housing growth and, in turn, strengthen the tax base over time. As set out above, aligning public services more closely with connected communities also offers the potential for better targeted and more efficient services, improved outcomes and reduced demand and expenditure in the long term. I have weighed these benefits against the additional

implementation costs, the risks of dividing services, the effects on the remaining East Sussex area and the contrary evidence. I recognise that this is a finely balanced judgement and that the risks will require careful management through the transition and governance arrangements described above. Nevertheless, I judge that the marginal sustainability gain, together with the further potential to strengthen the tax base through economic and housing growth and to reduce costs through more efficient public services, outweighs the additional short-term costs and transition risks. Taken together, these financial sustainability and public service benefits provide the strong justification required for the boundary change.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above and considering the options' performance against the criteria in the round, I am currently minded to proceed with a modified two unitary option. The factors that I currently regard as weighing particularly strongly are the functional economic, travel and service links between Brighton and Hove and the four transferred wards (criterion 1); the opportunity to bring planning, housing, regeneration, transport and local public services within one authority across that coastal area (criteria 1 and 3); and the broader population and planning footprint available to Brighton and Hove (criterion 2). I have weighed those advantages against the more complete evidence on efficiencies and lower implementation risk of the original two unitary option, the additional cost and ward-level disaggregation required by the modification, the effects on residual East Sussex, which I judge to remain of sufficient scale and resilience to absorb the boundary change, representations made by local partners, and the strength of local representation to the modified two unitary option.

I have given greater weight to the modified option's better fit with the coastal communities' functional urban area and geography and its wider tax and planning base, which offer greater long-term potential for coordinated growth, housing and local services. I have not selected the five unitary proposal because it does not meet criteria 2, 3 and 4. It would create less resilient councils, carry substantially greater implementation and service risks, and was developed without support from other councils in the area.

Status of this provisional view

This letter does not constitute a final decision to implement this or any other proposal.

The conclusions set out above represent my current provisional view, reached following consideration of the relevant material. Before reaching a final decision, I will consider all representations received in response to this letter together with any other relevant material.

I remain open to reaching a different conclusion following that consideration, including modifying the provisionally preferred proposal further, deciding to implement a different proposal, or deciding not to implement any proposal.

Invitation for representations

Relevant councils and other interested parties will be able to make representations on the provisional conclusions and reasoning set out in this letter. This representation period will be for a minimum of three weeks. I will confirm the exact timings shortly.

Representations should, where possible, address the provisional conclusions and any specific requests for information identified in this letter. I am grateful for the time already given to prepare and submit proposals, views and supporting evidence. There is no need to reproduce material submitted previously or repeat points that have already been made: that material will remain available to me when reaching the final decision.

The previous decision

I have today decided to withdraw the decision announced on 16 July 2026 concerning local government reorganisation in East Sussex and Brighton and Hove.

I am considering the proposals afresh and will reach a new final decision after considering the representations invited by this letter and any other relevant matters.

Statutory process

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 provides the statutory framework for local government structural change. The statutory process permits the Secretary of State to implement a proposal with or without modification following the required consultation.

If, following the further consideration described in this letter, the Secretary of State decides to implement a proposal, the structural changes would need to be provided for in a structural changes order under section 7 of the 2007 Act, subject to the applicable Parliamentary procedure.

This letter does not itself establish any new council, alter any existing local government boundary or otherwise implement structural change.

Capacity funding and other matters

I recognise that councils have already incurred costs associated with preparing for local government reorganisation and have committed significant time, resource and leadership to this work.

I am pleased to confirm that East Sussex and Brighton and Hove will be paid 50% of the £900,000 per new unitary transition support funding. This is equal to £900,000. Grants will be paid in November to the previously confirmed recipient authorities.

When final decisions are made, we will pay the balance of the £900,000 transition support per each new unitary, taking account of funding already paid to its area, as well as £150,000 of supplementary funding per new unitary for Leadership Capacity and Continuity in Children's Services, Adult Social Care and Public Health.

We are setting out further detail in the Written Ministerial Statement on city status and ceremonial matters, and the transition from the committee system.

I am copying this letter to your Chief Executives, MPs, the chair of the Sussex and Brighton Strategic Authority and the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner.

Yours sincerely,



JIM MCMAHON OBE MP

Minister for Local Government, Devolution and Regional Growth

George Dyson
Town Clerk

☎ (01273) 585493
✉ TownClerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk

Community House,
Meridian Way,
Peacehaven,
East Sussex,
BN10 8BB.

Full Council	FULL COUNCIL	**Agenda Item:**	C1631
Meeting date:	23 November 2026	**Authors:**	Rights of Way Working Group
Subject:	Update from the Rights of Way Working Group		
Purpose:	To note		

Recommendation(s):
To note: Update from the Rights of Way Working Group that reports to Full Council

1. Background

PTC's Rights of Way (RoW) Working Group works continuously to improve RoW and other pedestrian walkways in Peacehaven. Meetings have been held from time to time as required. The most recent meeting was held on September 4. Apologies were received from Cllr Griffiths. Members of the Group present were Cllrs Gordon Garrett and Campbell and Peter Seed, the local expert on Rights of Way who has worked for many years to ensure that RoW are formally recorded by East Sussex County Council (ESCC). He recently achieved approval as formal PRoW[1] from the Planning Inspectorate for five twittens in Telscombe Cliffs.

The informal notes of the meeting, updated with follow-up actions, are summarised as follows:

- Review of the actual and potential Rights of Way and other walkways itemised at an earlier meeting, updating progress and next steps (see Appendix).
- The Pedestrian footpath from the junction of Valley Road to The Lookout has long posed problems with unauthorised traffic using the footpath which runs across private land and is now shown as a road on many maps. (A further problem is that when used by HGVs the steepness and rough surface results in toxic fumes being released that can be trapped by the dry chalk valley's thermal inversion.) The official vehicular route to The Lookout is from Downs Walk along the bridleway. The private owners of the land containing the footpath had long ago authorised residents on The Lookout to use the footpath for vehicular access to their homes and it also provides vehicular access to the reservoir. In its recent Planning Application for a glamping site at 66 The Lookout (agreed with conditions by ESCC for the eastern area around the house, but refused by SDNP for the western part of the site within the South Downs National Park, SDNP), the Applicant showed the footpath as the main vehicular access route. Peter Seed has written to ask clarification that it is not a road. The police have suggested better signposting, which could be taken up by Planning Committee. The Working Group (with Cllr Gordon Garrett abstaining) decided to ask PTC officers to

[1]Public Rights of Way have formal protection that is not necessarily applicable to all other pedestrian pathways. The RoW Working Party covers all types,

take up the issue of the Official Footpath being treated as a public road if Peter Seed does not receive a satisfactory response.

- Peter Seed reported potentially unauthorised new tracks being installed at right angles to Links Road RoW, which appeared to be in breach of the Article 4 Direction that constrains development in that area. Cllrs KGG and MC agreed to take up these issues with the Town Clerk and East Ward councillors. High fencing has been installed on the western side. The site opposite is within the SDNP and subdivided into multiple potential individual building sites, one of which was proposed for development some time ago (application rejected, including by Inspector after Appeal). Enforcement has been needed for other issues. A further problem has arisen with addition of a new track, although no planning application or enforcement seem to be recorded.
- It was agreed to ask the Town Clerk to contact ESCC (Highway Land Information Team) to ask for the map showing all routes in Peacehaven it regards as adopted highways including twittens and cycle routes. Given Peacehaven's possible move into Brighton and Hove, it was important that the Town Council held these records independently. PTC officers are following this up.

2. Options for Council

To note

3. Reason for recommendation

To inform Council and residents

4. **Expected benefits**

Transparency

Implications

5.1 Legal	Clarification of protected routes and future routes; protection of RoW
5.2 Risks	
5.3 Financial	
5.4 Time scales	Immediate and continuing
5.5 Stakeholders & Social Value	All pedestrians and wheeling community
5.6 Contracts	
5.7 Climate & Sustainability	Maintaining valuable and sustainable non-vehicular routes, better air quality
5.8 Crime & Disorder	Removing unauthorised fencing and unauthorised use of pedestrian RoW
5.9 Health & Safety	Maintaining routes means more exercise sites and safer walkways, improved physical and mental health
5.10 Biodiversity	RoW are essential for maintaining hedges etc
5.11 Privacy Impact	
5.12 Equality & Diversity	

5. Values & priorities alignment

Which of the Core Values does the recommendation demonstrate?	
6.1 Empowering and supporting the community	X
6.2 Growing the economy sustainably	☐
6.3 Helping children and young people	X
6.4 Improving the quality of life for residents and visitors to Peacehaven	X

6.5 Supporting residents in need	X
6.6 Valuing the environment	X

6.7 Which business plan item(s) does the recommendation relate to?
Footpaths, Bridleways and cycle/wheeling routes; Assets of nature, biodiversity and built environment; Net Zero Carbon Resolution.

6. Appendices

The RoW Working Group's review of its programme and the pathways proposed for action, including to apply for formal recognition are as follows:

- Valley Lane (north-south route between Valley Road and east end of The Lookout that has been fenced off by landowners but was in use by pedestrians, carts etc for decades before that). The call for evidence on PTC website has yielded some responses, and others need to be finally recorded. Peter Seed has collected much documentary evidence, but a lot more work needs to be done before submission to ESCC. Peter Seed was thanked for his work on this. There have been modest financial costs to him and Cllrs KGG and MC have requested payment from PTC.
- `16c` Potential east-west RoW between the existing 16b and Links Avenue northern extension PRoW (footpath Peacehaven 3) that leads to Bollen Bush (in Newhaven). Peter Seed will move onto this as his priority after the Valley Lane PRoW submission is complete. It is often overgrown (he clears it as required as do others).
- Cornwall Avenue path (Footpath Peacehaven 8) to join Footpath Peacehaven 3 and thence to northern boundary of Tudor Rose field, Maple Road and A259. This much-used route with its four links into the adjacent Ashington area of east Peacehaven is not officially listed as a PRoW. It might in future come under threat from developers. When time permits, Peter Seed will prepare forms and the necessary accompanying map for Cllrs KGG, MC and other volunteers to collect signatures in case urgent action is needed to get this path formally recorded.
- Footpath Peacehaven 9. From Maple Road alongside Tudor Rose a short stretch needs clearing and waymarking. Cllrs KGG and MC to follow up.
- Rushey Hill caravan park area: this had been checked with Vicki Onis some time ago; Cllr MC to recheck. The track along the east side of the Rushey Hill Caravan Site from The Highway to the clifftop (continuing at the parish boundary with Footpath Newhaven 14) needs a formal PRoW application. The majority of it was formalised as Icknield Way in Charles Neville's Peacehaven Heights Estate. It was also known as Gun Lane, presumably from the World War II structures along the route.
- Area between old Motel site, the sea and caravan park: also needs rechecking.
- Southview to Big Park: vehicular access now blocked.
- Hoyle Road north and westwards: no further action. Note proposals for east-west cycle routes to be discussed with Telscombe Town Council. The Map displayed in Centenary Park shows a route leaving the park to the north-west that subsisted for many years running along the northern fenceline of PCS playing fields (but on the outside of the fencing): it is now lost within the gardens of Chalkers Rise dwellings.

George Dyson
Town Clerk

☎ (01273) 585493
✉ TownClerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk

Community House,
Meridian Way,
Peacehaven,
East Sussex,
BN10 8BB.

Committee:	Full Council	**Agenda Item:**	C1632
Meeting date:	23rd November 2026	**Authors:**	Town Clerk
Subject:	Interview Panel for Caretaker Vacancy		
Purpose:	To agree		

Recommendation(s):
To agree an interview panel for the current Caretaker vacancy.

1. Background

At the Personnel Committee meeting on 20th October, it was agreed to commence recruitment for a Caretaker, that recruitment is currently underway with a closing date of 27th November 2026.

Interview panels are formed of 2 Councillors and a member of staff, it's suggested that the Facilities Manager be the staff member to join the panel, and Council are asked to appoint 2 Councillors.

The interviews are anticipated to take place during the day on 9th December 2026, although we will have some flexibility on this if requested by candidates.

Recommendations from the interview panel will need to be ratified by Full Council.

2. Options for Council

To agree members to form an interview panel for the Caretaker position

3. Reason for recommendation

Ensuring a fair and transparent process for all prospective applicants.

4. Expected benefits

Ensuring a full cohort of staff, that Community House and other PTC facilities are able to operate efficiently.

5. Implications

5.1 Legal	Employment Rights Act 1996 PTC Staff Handbook & Policies
5.2 Risks	Impacting on the operation of Community House
5.3 Financial	Salary agreed through Committee in line with budgets
5.4 Time scales	
5.5 Stakeholders & Social Value	Community House is a key Community Facility for Peacehaven
5.6 Contracts	Contracts to be issued to successful candidate
5.7 Climate & Sustainability	Included in Job Description
5.8 Crime & Disorder	
5.9 Health & Safety	Included in role job description
5.10 Biodiversity	
5.11 Privacy Impact	In line with Policy
5.12 Equality & Diversity	In line with Policy

6. Values & priorities alignment

Which of the Core Values does the recommendation demonstrate?	
6.1 Empowering and supporting the community	☒
6.2 Growing the economy sustainably	☒
6.3 Helping children and young people	☐
6.4 Improving the quality of life for residents and visitors to Peacehaven	☐
6.5 Supporting residents in need	☒
6.6 Valuing the environment	☒

6.7 Which business plan item(s) does the recommendation relate to?

Efficiency of PTC resources
Community House
Carbon net-zero pledge.

7. Appendices

Caretaker Recruitment Pack

Peacehaven Town Council

Job Description – Caretaker

Reports to: Facilities Manager
Responsible for: The day-to-day caretaking, cleaning, presentation, security and safe operation of Council buildings and facilities
Hours: 37 hours per week, with an expectation for periodic paid overtime
Salary/Scale: SCP 6 - £26,847 per annum
Location: Peacehaven Town Council premises and other Council-owned buildings and facilities

1. Job Purpose

To provide a high standard of caretaking, cleaning, maintenance and customer service across Peacehaven Town Council's buildings and facilities.

The Caretaker will work as part of the Facilities team and will be responsible for ensuring that Council buildings are clean, secure, safe, welcoming and appropriately prepared for staff, hirers, community groups and members of the public.

The postholder will work under the direction of the Facilities Manager and will undertake duties across the Council's buildings and facilities as required.

The nature of the role requires flexibility in outlook and approach, including the ability to work different shifts, including lone-working and, where required, evenings, weekends and out-of-hours call-outs. The postholder will be expected to use their initiative in responding and adapting to the needs of the role.

2. Principal Responsibilities

A. Caretaking and Building Operations

- Undertake day-to-day caretaking duties across the Town Council's buildings and facilities.
- Open and secure Council buildings in accordance with established procedures.
- Ensure buildings are appropriately secured when not in use.
- Undertake routine checks of buildings, reporting any faults, damage, defects or security concerns to the Facilities Manager.
- Check that buildings are appropriately prepared for staff, Council activities, meetings, events and hirers.
- Assist with the preparation and setting up of rooms in accordance with agreed room layouts and booking requirements.
- Move tables, chairs and other equipment as reasonably required and in accordance with safe working practices.

- Assist with the setting up and clearing of rooms following meetings, events and bookings.
- Ensure communal areas, entrances and other public-facing areas are kept clean, tidy and presentable.
- Report any building defects or maintenance requirements promptly to the Facilities Manager.

B. Cleaning

- Undertake regular cleaning of the Town Council's buildings and facilities in accordance with cleaning schedules and instructions issued by the Facilities Manager.
- Maintain high standards of cleanliness and hygiene throughout Council premises.
- Clean offices, meeting rooms, kitchens, toilets, communal areas and other designated areas.
- Use cleaning materials, chemicals and equipment safely and in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and Council procedures.
- Comply with COSHH requirements relating to cleaning products and other hazardous substances.
- Ensure cleaning materials and equipment are stored safely and securely.
- Report shortages, damaged equipment or concerns regarding cleaning products to the Facilities Manager.
- Dispose of waste appropriately and in accordance with Council procedures.

C. Hirers and Customer Service

Caretakers are often the first point of contact between the Town Council and members of the public using its facilities and are therefore expected to provide a professional and welcoming service.

Duties will include:

- Welcoming hirers, visitors and members of the public using Council facilities.
- Providing assistance with reasonable queries relating to the building and facilities.
- Ensuring rooms and facilities are prepared in accordance with information provided by the Information & Community Facilities Officer and/or Facilities Manager.
- Liaising with hirers regarding room layouts, access and equipment where appropriate.
- Reporting any concerns, complaints or incidents involving hirers or members of the public to the Facilities Manager or appropriate Council Officer.
- Maintaining a professional standard of personal appearance and conduct.
- Wearing Council-provided uniform and appropriate protective clothing when required.

D. Equipment and Facilities

- Undertake regular visual inspections of equipment used by staff and hirers.
- Ensure equipment, including kitchen equipment, is clean and appears safe and serviceable before use.
- Report defective or damaged equipment immediately to the Facilities Manager.
- Remove defective equipment from use where there is a reasonable concern that its continued use may present a risk.
- Assist with the safe storage and movement of Council equipment.
- Carry out basic checks and minor adjustments where trained and authorised to do so.

E. Minor Maintenance

- Undertake minor maintenance and repair work where this is within the postholder's competence, training and authority and can be completed safely.
- Report maintenance requirements that cannot safely or appropriately be undertaken by the Caretaker to the Facilities Manager.
- Assist contractors or other authorised persons with access to buildings and work areas.
- Where required, assist with minor grounds, external area or amenity maintenance associated with Council buildings.
- Report damage, vandalism, leaks, defective fixtures, lighting faults and other maintenance concerns promptly.

Caretakers must not undertake work for which they are not appropriately trained, competent or authorised.

F. Contractors

- Liaise with contractors attending Council premises as directed by the Facilities Manager.
- Provide access to authorised contractors where required.
- Ensure contractors are directed to the appropriate work area.
- Follow instructions provided by the Facilities Manager regarding contractor access and working arrangements.
- Ensure, where reasonably practicable, that members of the public and other unauthorised persons do not enter areas where contractors are undertaking work.
- Report any concerns regarding contractor activity, unsafe working practices or damage to Council property to the Facilities Manager.
- Assist contractors with access, isolation of areas and other reasonable practical requirements where safe to do so.

The Caretaker does not have responsibility for approving contractor works, expenditure or contractual arrangements unless specifically delegated by the Facilities Manager.

G. Health and Safety

- Work in accordance with the Council's Health and Safety policies, procedures and risk assessments.
- Take reasonable care for their own health and safety and that of others who may be affected by their work.
- Follow all relevant safe working procedures.
- Use appropriate personal protective equipment where required.
- Report hazards, accidents, incidents, near misses and unsafe conditions promptly.
- Follow COSHH procedures and manufacturers' instructions when using cleaning products and other substances.
- Follow manual handling procedures and use appropriate equipment where necessary.
- Ensure areas presenting an immediate risk are made safe or isolated where reasonably practicable and report the matter immediately to the Facilities Manager.
- Assist with emergency procedures and building evacuations.
- Undertake required health and safety training.

H. Fire Safety and Emergency Procedures

- Familiarise themselves with the fire and emergency procedures applicable to each Council building in which they work.
- Assist with the safe evacuation of buildings when required.
- Act as a Fire Marshal where trained and designated to do so.
- Report fire safety concerns, blocked escape routes, defective fire doors, emergency lighting concerns or other issues immediately.
- Never obstruct fire exits, escape routes or emergency access points.
- Assist with routine visual checks of fire safety equipment and systems as instructed by the Facilities Manager.
- Respond appropriately to emergencies occurring during working hours and follow Council procedures.

I. Building Inspections and Reporting

Undertake routine visual checks of Council buildings as directed by the Facilities Manager, including:

- General condition of rooms and communal areas.
- Doors, windows and locks.
- Lighting.
- Heating and ventilation.
- Toilets and plumbing.
- Kitchen facilities.
- Furniture and equipment.
- Fire exits and escape routes.
- Signs of water leaks or damage.
- Security concerns.
- Vandalism or damage.
- General cleanliness and presentation.

Any defects or concerns must be reported promptly to the Facilities Manager.

J. Public Toilets and External Facilities

Where allocated, undertake routine duties associated with Town Council-owned public toilets and other external facilities, including:

- Checking supplies and reporting requirements.
- Reporting damage, vandalism or defects.
- Reporting plumbing, lighting or other maintenance problems.
- Ensuring facilities are maintained appropriately for public use.
- Carrying out routine checks as directed by the Facilities Manager.
- Responding to urgent issues in accordance with Council procedures.

K. Out-of-Hours Responsibilities

- Participate in the Council's caretaker rota for out-of-hours call-outs where required.
- Provide reasonable cover for colleagues' absence and sickness at short notice where practicable.
- Respond appropriately to building-related emergencies in accordance with Council procedures.
- Attend Council premises when required under agreed out-of-hours arrangements.
- Report incidents and actions taken to the Facilities Manager at the earliest appropriate opportunity.

L. Team Working

- Work cooperatively with other caretakers, cleaners and Council staff.
- Support colleagues in maintaining consistent standards across all Council premises.
- Assist the Facilities Manager with tasks and projects as reasonably required.
- Communicate effectively with colleagues regarding building conditions, maintenance issues, hirer requirements and other operational matters.
- Contribute positively to the continuous improvement of the Council's buildings and services.

3. Training and Development

The postholder will be expected to undertake training required to carry out their duties safely and effectively.

Training may include, but is not limited to:

- Health and Safety.
- COSHH.
- Fire Warden/Fire Safety.
- First Aid.
- Manual Handling.
- Equality and Diversity.
- GDPR and information governance.
- Customer Service.
- Use of cleaning equipment and substances.
- Any other training reasonably required by the Council.

The postholder must not undertake work requiring specialist training or competence unless appropriately trained and authorised.

4. General Responsibilities

- Comply with all Council policies, procedures and instructions relevant to the role.
- Maintain confidentiality in accordance with Council requirements.
- Comply with GDPR and information governance requirements.

- Treat members of the public, hirers, colleagues and contractors courteously and professionally.
- Maintain appropriate standards of personal presentation and conduct.
- Use Council property, equipment and resources responsibly.
- Report loss, damage or misuse of Council property.
- Maintain appropriate security of keys, access codes and other Council property entrusted to the postholder.
- Undertake such other duties as may reasonably be requested by the Facilities Manager or Town Clerk, consistent with the level and nature of the post.
- Undertake any training reasonably required to fulfil the duties of the role.

5. Working Environment

The role will involve working across the Town Council's buildings and facilities and may involve working evenings, weekends and outside normal office hours as part of the Council's agreed rota arrangements.

The post involves physical activity, including cleaning, moving furniture and equipment, building inspections and minor maintenance tasks.

The postholder must be able to work safely in a variety of environments and follow appropriate risk assessments, safe systems of work and instructions.

This job description is intended to describe the principal responsibilities and duties of the post. It is not an exhaustive list and the postholder may be required to undertake other duties reasonably consistent with the level and nature of the role.

Peacehaven Town Council

Caretaker – Personal Specification

Key Criteria	Essential	Desirable
Qualifications	• Willingness to undertake relevant training required for the role, including health and safety, COSHH and manual handling.	• Relevant qualification or training in caretaking, facilities maintenance, cleaning or a related field. • Relevant health and safety, fire safety, and/or first aid training.
Experience	• Experience of cleaning, caretaking, maintenance or similar practical work. • Experience of working independently and completing tasks to an agreed standard. • Experience of providing a helpful and courteous service to customers, colleagues or members of the public.	• Experience of working in public buildings, community facilities or premises used by multiple groups. • Experience of setting up rooms and equipment for meetings, events or bookings. • Experience of carrying out basic building checks and minor maintenance tasks.
Skills & Abilities	• Ability to carry out cleaning, caretaking and basic maintenance duties safely and effectively. • Ability to identify and report hazards, defects, damage and maintenance requirements promptly. • Good organisational skills, with the ability to prioritise tasks and work to schedules. • Ability to communicate clearly and courteously with colleagues, hirers, contractors and members of the public. • Ability to work independently, use initiative and follow instructions and procedures.	• Ability to undertake a range of minor repairs and practical maintenance tasks. • Familiarity with cleaning equipment, maintenance tools and relevant safety procedures. • Ability to assist with the safe preparation and operation of community events and activities.

Other Attributes	• Reliable, punctual and conscientious, with a positive attitude towards work. • Physically able to undertake the duties of the role, including cleaning, moving furniture and equipment, and routine building checks, with appropriate equipment and safe working practices. • Willingness to work flexibly, including occasional evenings, weekends and out-of-hours call-outs as required by the Council's arrangements. • Committed to maintaining high standards of cleanliness, safety, security and presentation. • Professional, approachable and respectful, with a commitment to confidentiality, teamwork and good customer service.	• A flexible approach to supporting the wider Facilities team during busy periods or staff absences. • Full driving licence and access to a vehicle.



JOB VACANCY

We are looking to recruit a:

Caretaker

- Full time position - 37 hours p/w
- £26,847 per annum + Paid Overtime
- LGPS Pension Scheme & Staff Benefits
- 23 Days Annual Leave

TO DISCUSS THE ROLE, OR TO APPLY, EMAIL THE TOWN CLERK AT TOWNCLERK@PEACEHAVENTOWNCOUNCIL.GOV.UK

CLOSING DATE: 27TH NOVEMBER 2026

01273 585493 www.peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk Community House, BN10 8BB