Dear Clare, HPC Clerk,

At the meeting on 5th August the Council were asked to decide whether to stop members of the public, who were not plot holders, from accessing the allotment field which the Parish Council leases from the Church Commissioners.

A vote was taken on an agenda proposal entitled "Allotment Matters 2" which was a composite proposal containing 4 items. The proposal stated that suggestions regarding stopping public access were welcome to be brought back to the Council at a later date, but a vote was carried to stop access.

There has been no justification for stopping public access. Most of the issues on the proposal have been addressed and dealt with, including reducing dog poo and removing animals from the site. The additional boundary security still needs addressing.

Following that PC meeting an Allotment Advisory Group meeting was held on site with CA & LTH, along with Simon Emeny (Hartlebury Allotment Association Group Chair) and someone named Jordan. This was held on a Saturday when, unfortunately, JC & CN were unable to attend at such short notice. At that meeting it was decided that the gate would be moved towards the road to stop any pedestrians being able to walk around the gate. This has not been approved by the Council and no alternatives have been looked at or quoted for.

It appears, judging by the plan submitted with the 1973 lease of the field, that there is a permissive path across the allotment field. This path leads down to the bottom left hand corner and links up with the path leading to Rectory Lane (that path was blocked off by members of the previous council).

We believe that the Council's decision to block access to residents of the Parish is incorrect and should be reversed. Guidance should be sought from the Church Commissioners via their agent to confirm whether or not they have allowed a permissive path. In the minutes of the Parish Council meeting of 4th November 2014 it was stated that there was a permissive path.

There was no consultation of the allotment plot holders regarding this matter and there has been a considerable backlash to this proposal from members of the public (dog walkers or not). It is perceived as a poor unnecessary decision.

Please place this item on the next agenda.

Regards,

Cllr J Cosham, Cllr J Hipkins, Cllr R Kirby, Cllr C Neale,