

Application for a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) – Saint Hill Road and West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead

REPORT OF: Deputy Chief Executive
Contact Officer: Lucy Corrie, Assistant Director Communities
lucy.corrie@midsussex.gov.uk
Report to: Cabinet
Wards Affected: Ashurst Wood and East Grinstead South
Key Decision: No
30 June 2025

Purpose of Report

1. To set out to Cabinet the process followed, and actions taken to consider and make a recommendation in respect to the request by Hodkin and Company Solicitors on behalf of their clients the Church of Scientology Religious Education College Inc of Saint Hill Manor, Saint Hill Road, East Grinstead (“the Church”) dated 15 July 2024 that Mid Sussex District Council (“MSDC”) consider making a Public Spaces Protection Order (“PSPO”). The effect of the PSPO proposed would be to prohibit any demonstrators from conducting their activities on the public highway and public land (verge) adjoining the public highway on Saint Hill Road and West Hoathly Road at any time for three years. The request is made under section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014.

Summary

2. On 2 October 2024, the Scrutiny Committee for People and Communities reviewed and endorsed the process to consider the PSPO request made by Hodkin and Company Solicitors on behalf of their clients the Church dated 15 July 2024.
3. The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (“**ASBCPA**”) provides the legislative framework for making PSPOs.

Recommendations

4. **Cabinet are recommended to:**
 - (i) **Carefully consider this report and all of the documents appended to it; and**
 - (ii) **not make a PSPO on Saint Hill Road and West Hoathly Road in East Grinstead.**

Background

5. On 15 July 2024, Hodkin and Company Solicitors on behalf of their clients the Church requested this Council consider making a PSPO to cover the area immediately surrounding the Church. The application and the evidence it included in support is located at **Appendix A**. The proposed PSPO area is in Appendix A page 7. Maps of the general area are at **Appendix B(a)**. The purpose of the PSPO requested is to prevent demonstrations, protests, vigils or similar activity around the Church's premises. The request was connected in particular to an International Association of Scientology ("IAS") event which takes place annually in October or November each year. The request was premised on the basis that demonstrations and protests outside Church premises during these events have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, presenting both a risk to public safety and causing harassment, disturbance and alarm to those attending the Church, and that such activities have had and will have such effect, and the effect is or is likely to be of a continuing nature such as to make activities unreasonable and justify the restrictions.
6. On 2 October 2024 the Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the assessment process the Council proposed to undertake to determine if a PSPO should be granted. The Council has subsequently followed that process and taken advice from counsel and legal services throughout the process (which is subject to legal privilege and therefore remains confidential) to support the work of gathering and assessing evidence to reach the recommendation to Cabinet.
7. It is key that in making a decision the Council should carefully weigh the Church's request against the legal requirements, potential impacts on the human rights of all stakeholders, and the need for proportionality. Evidence is required in support of a PSPO. There should be an available body of material which gives the local authority reasonable grounds to be satisfied the statutory tests are met.

Legal Requirements

8. The making of a PSPO is an executive function of the Council. The Assistant Director, Communities has delegated authority under the constitution to make such an Order. However, statutory guidance under the ASBCPA advises that Elected Members should be involved in such a decision (see p.66 of the Statutory Guidance made under section 73 of the [Anti-social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014](#)). The Scrutiny Committee endorsed the recommendation for Cabinet to make the final decision on this issue.
9. The statutory guidance (revised March 2023) is at **Appendix B(b)**. Chapter 2.5 of the statutory guidance sets out the purpose of PSPOs, who can make a PSPO, the legal tests, and consultation requirements. PSPOs are intended to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in a specific area that is detrimental to the local community's quality of life, by imposing conditions on the use of that area which apply to everyone. They are intended to help ensure that the law abiding majority can use and enjoy public spaces, safe from anti-social behaviour. Given that these orders can restrict what people can do and how they behave in public spaces, it is important that the restrictions imposed are focused on specific behaviours and are proportionate to the detrimental effect that the behaviour is causing or can cause, and are necessary to prevent it from continuing, occurring or recurring. When considering a request for a PSPO the Council must take into account the legislative framework as follows:

Power to make a PSPO under the ASBCPA

10. The following summarises the key statutory provisions engaged when considering whether to make a PSPO:

- (i) Sections 59(1)-(3) of the ASBCPA state that a local authority may make a PSPO if satisfied on reasonable grounds that two conditions are met. The first condition is that activities carried on in a public place within the authority's area have had a **detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality**, or it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place within that area and that they will have such an effect.
 - (ii) The second condition is that the effect, or likely effect, of the activities (a) is, or is likely to be, of a **persistent or continuing nature**, (b) is, or is likely to be, such as to make the activities **unreasonable**, and (c) **justifies** the restrictions imposed by the notice.
 - (iii) Section 59(4) makes clear that a PSPO is an order that identifies the public place where the detrimental activities are carried out, and which (a) prohibits specified things being done in the restricted area, (b) requires specified things to be done by persons carrying on specified activities in that area, or (c) does both of those things.
 - (iv) Section 59(5) states that the only prohibitions or requirements that may be imposed are ones that are **reasonable** to impose in order (a) to prevent the detrimental effect continuing, occurring or recurring or (b) to reduce that detrimental effect or to reduce the risk of its continuance, occurrence or recurrence.
 - (v) A prohibition or requirement may be framed (a) so as to apply to all persons, or only to persons in specified categories, (b) at all times, or only at specified times, or at all times except those specified; or (c) so as to apply in all circumstances, or only in specified circumstances, or in all circumstances except those specified: s.59(6).
 - (vi) Section 59(7) states a PSPO must (a) identify the activities which have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, (b) insofar as relevant to the current circumstances, explain that it is an offence for a person without reasonable excuse to do anything prohibited by a PSPO or to fail to comply with a PSPO in accordance with s.67 ASBCPA; and (c) specify the period for which the order has effect.
 - (vii) Section 59(8) requires local authorities to publish any PSPO in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary of State.
11. Putting together these statutory tests in sequence, in order to make a PSPO Cabinet must be satisfied of each of the following:
- (i) Have there been activities or behaviour carried on in a public place within the authority's area?
 - (ii) Have those activities or behaviour had a detrimental effect on quality of life?
 - (iii) Has that effect been felt by 'those in the locality'?
 - (iv) Alternatively, if (i)-(iii) are not yet satisfied, is it likely that such activities will be carried on and will have such an effect on those persons?
 - (v) If yes, is the effect of the behaviour on those in the locality of a persistent or continuing nature? (or likely to be of that nature?)

- (vi) If yes, is the effect of the behaviour on those in the locality also such as to make the activities unreasonable? (or likely to be unreasonable?)
 - (vii) If yes, are the restrictions and requirements imposed by the PSPO both justified and reasonable in order to prevent the detrimental effect from continuing, occurring or recurring, or to reduce the risk of the same?
12. It is important to note local authorities enjoy a wide discretion to decide for themselves which behaviours cause ‘**detrimental effect**’ on the quality of life in their particular area, relying on local knowledge and exercising judgment. It is sufficient if there is evidence that activities are taking place which are detrimental to some people in the locality. The authority is required to consider persons who may be particularly affected by activities and behaviours, such as those who are vulnerable, the elderly and children. ‘Those in the locality’ for the purposes of s.59 can include occasional visitors to the area, rather than only those who live or work locally.
13. The activities and/or behaviour must have a ‘persistent and continuing effect’ on them. This means the detrimental effect must impact people’s ‘quality of life’ in a persistent or continuing way; thus, the effect on them must be more than fleeting or transient or momentary. The more trifling the effect of the behaviour – or the more infrequent its occurrence – the less likely that the necessary statutory threshold for a PSPO is met. Conversely, the more serious the effect of the behaviour, the more likely that it would meet the statutory threshold even if it has only occurred once or twice. The behaviour must be anti-social rather than merely annoying or trivial, otherwise it will not be ‘reasonable’ to prohibit it.

Human Rights

14. Section 72(1) of the ASBCPA states that a local authority must have particular regard to the rights of freedom of expression and freedom of assembly set out in articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights (“**ECHR**”) when making decisions relating to any PSPO. In this case those rights are clearly enjoyed and exercised by those persons who assemble and engage in protest activities outside Church premises. However the s.72(1) duty to ‘have regard’ does not preclude the Council from having regard to other Convention rights, especially those which compete with protesters’ Article 10 and 11 rights. In this case, competing rights include the rights to freedom of thought, conscience and religion under Article 9 ECHR which are enjoyed by members of and visitors to the Church and its premises. Reported case law dealing with PSPOs has reiterated that human rights as such are of equal value in the sense that none has precedence over the other. Therefore, any conflict between them must be resolved by focusing carefully on the comparative importance of the rights in play and the necessity and proportionality of any interference with them. This means that a decision to make a PSPO – or not make a PSPO – must be decided impartially and with careful regard to the evidence available.

Licencing requirements

15. Saint Hill Manor operates under a Premises Licence issued by this Council. The licence can be found at **Appendix C**. Paragraph 9 page 6 sets out that 10 events are permitted each year, and the Church is required to notify the relevant health and safety enforcing authority of all upcoming events to be held within the grounds of Saint Hill Manor, 6 weeks prior to the actual event occurring, detailing the nature of the event and any activities carried out on site. In 2023 the Church shared their IAS event management plan three weeks before the event. In 2024 an event management plan was provided by the Church five weeks in advance of the IAS event. However the date of the IAS event was not shared until 7 October which was 3 weeks before the IAS event.
16. In addition, a Noise Management Plan must be submitted to the Licensing Authority for all licensable activities at the premises. This is a requirement of the Licensing Act 2003. The plan will be reviewed annually and if necessary, during its term, as required. It must be submitted to the Licensing Authority on or before the anniversary of the issue of the Licence, 2 August (being the anniversary of the first premises licence issued in 2009). In 2023 a noise management plan was received three weeks before the IAS and five weeks before the IAS event in 2024.

Actions to Date

Observations and surveys of the event

17. The Church presented evidence of protests at their annual IAS event in 2023 to support their July 2024 application for a PSPO. In accordance with the approach endorsed by the Scrutiny Committee, this Council's officers observed the IAS event held between 25-27 October 2024 ("**IAS 2024**").
18. In advance of the observations, Council officers wanted to gather as much evidence relating to protests at the IAS event as possible. A leaflet was produced for local residents, businesses, visitors to the IAS and protesters seeking opinions on the event and protest. The leaflet is at **Appendix D**. It was published online and was handed out in person at the IAS event. A link was provided on the leaflet to encourage people to complete an online questionnaire giving further detail on their views of the event.
19. Online questionnaires were prepared to record observations from the IAS 2024 event. Completed questionnaires were gathered from 29 Church visitors, 16 protesters and 11 residents of East Grinstead. The questions for each group are at **Appendix E**. Council staff who observed the event recorded their own testimony and reflections, as well as views and statements given to them by other persons during the event, and Sussex Police have provided statements giving their views on both the 2023 and 2024 events. The Police statements are at **Appendices F(a) – F(d) below**,

Appendix F(a)	Police Sergeant who attended Saint Hill Manor Road on 3 November 2023,
Appendix F(b)	Police Officer who attended Saint Hill Manor Road on 5 November 2023
Appendix F(c)	Police Officer who attended Saint Hill Manor Road on 25 October 2024
Appendix F(d)	Police Sergeant who attended Saint Hill Manor Road on 26 and 27 October 2024.

20. In addition, seventy one letters were sent to local residents and businesses ahead of the IAS 2024 seeking their views. The letter dated 23 October 2024 is at **Appendix G(a)**. A map showing the area where local residents and businesses were invited to comment is at **Appendix G(b)**.
21. Following this evidence gathering exercise an evidence log has been collated and can be found at **Appendix G(c)**. 218 separate observation logs have been recorded for 2024 and 27 separate observation logs have been recorded for 2023. In summary the evidence demonstrates that some behaviour has taken place which is capable of causing nuisance and/or a detrimental effect on the quality of life in the locality, particularly for local residents, primarily in respect to the following areas:
- (i) Traffic disruption and tailbacks;
 - (ii) The risk of pedestrians walking in the road in the dark;
 - (iii) The Church playing amplified music at loud volumes;
 - (iv) Protesters engaged in chanting slogans such as “the abuse has to stop”;
 - (v) Protesters filming and/or livestreaming their own activities and also attendees to the IAS event;
 - (vi) The Church recording or filming footage at the entrance to its premises which protesters perceived as an attempt to record their activities.
22. The overarching comments made by the Church members and supporters in respect to the 2023 IAS is protesters shouting and ‘yelling’ which they believe was designed to be intimidating (page 8 Appendix A), unfriendly behaviour which made some visitors scared (page 9 Appendix A). A local resident found the protester behaviour offensive, rude and unpleasant. (page 11 Appendix A). A visitor said protesters filmed her and her children close to their car and they were intimidating (Page 12 appendix A) Another visitor said the traffic on Saint Hill Road was gridlocked and they saw a few near accidents (page 16 Appendix A) It should be noted that there is no specific evidence about how the protesters were offensive and exactly what they said to cause distress.
23. The Council observers and Sussex Police at the 2024 IAS said that protesters and Church security staff were polite and not aggressive at any time. However, security staff were wearing black and no hi-viz which was confusing to visitors and dangerous for road users. Some visitors mistook protesters who were wearing hi-viz for car park stewards and asked for directions. This caused confusion as people mistook protesters for stewards and vice-versa. Unfortunately, from the Council’s perspective this also has the effect of potentially rendering some third-party reports unreliable, because it is unclear whether observers attributed ‘bad’ behaviour to the ‘correct’ group.
24. It was evident that traffic management was poor and at times the traffic was chaotic. There were a few near misses observed. See photos at **Appendix H**. The photos show heavy traffic congestion with pedestrians mixed with traffic. Visitors to the IAS event were walking along Saint Hill Road in the dark wearing mainly dark clothing. This was considered dangerous by observers.
25. When considering the evidence gathered, the council must consider the issues of reasonableness, justification and proportionality which are critical to decision making.

West Sussex County Council Highways Authority.

26. Following the collation of observations gathered before and after the IAS 2024 event, Mid Sussex Council officers met West Sussex County Council Highways Authority (“**WSCCHA**”) and Sussex Police to seek their views on the observations made during the IAS event. The notes from WSCCHA meeting of 7 February 2025 are at **Appendix I**.
27. In summary, WSCCHA stated that to properly manage the risks created by the IAS they need to know the plans for the event. To do this the Church must share an event management plan with both WSCC and MSDC at least 6 weeks prior to the event. Without this there are risks to visitors attending the event.
28. WSCCHA considered that the Church need to move their visitors off Saint Hill Road as quickly and safely as possible and creating larger car parks inside the Saint Hill Manor grounds would improve safety greatly.
29. Saint Hill Road is a relatively rural road that is unlit, without pavements and has a 60 MPH speed limit. See Appendix B(a). Speed limits are introduced based on data for killed and seriously injured on a road and not to facilitate private events off the highway. WSCCHA do not consider a reduction in speed limit would be proportionate in this case.
30. WSCCHA do not usually provide street lighting on rural highways. They have confirmed that they would not fund street lighting on Saint Hill Road because it is not proportionate to do so for a 3-day off highway annual event. In addition, they have stated that street lighting would contribute to urbanisation which is not desirable. Furthermore, the costs would be too high for WSCC to bear, and it is unlikely a suitable power supply is nearby.
31. However, WSCCHA advised that if the Church shared an event management and traffic management plan, offering temporary alternative lighting solutions these were likely to supported by WSCC. An example given was that the Church could hire large outdoor lights such as those used in major roadworks to light the road around their entrance from inside their own grounds. If the lights were placed without dazzling drivers, this solution may be acceptable to WSCCHA.
32. To avoid pedestrians walking in the dark in the road, an additional pedestrian entrance into Saint Hill grounds much nearer to the rugby club was discussed. See Appendix B(a). WSCCHA agreed this could be an improvement to road safety, but the Church must consult fully with WSCC on plans to create a new entrance off the highway.

Sussex Police

33. The notes of the Sussex Police meeting of 10 February 2025 are at **Appendix J**. Sussex Police confirmed that at the IAS event in 2023 and 2024, no arrests were made, and no hate speech was reported to them. However, the Police identified an issue with the Church not wanting the protesters to stand directly beside their entrance gates and the protesters did not want to stand on the grass verge away from the entrance at Rockwood Park. See Appendix B(a) for the locations of these entrances. The Police’s power under the Public Order Act 1986 to force people to stand in a particular area was discussed. The Police confirmed that the use of this power would not be proportionate in this case. As no public order infringements took place, no arrests were made or cautions or warnings issued in either 2023 or 2024, they considered it would be counterintuitive to rely on the Public Order Act to move protesters to the Rockwood Park grass verge away from the entrance.

34. The Church have indicated that the presence of Council observers at the 2024 event ensured the protesters were better behaved than in 2023. This is not supported by the Police witness statements at Appendix F which confirms no arrests were made in 2023 or 2024, that they had no concerns about protesters' behaviour in 2023, and that in all cases the event was peaceful between all parties.
35. The Police also considered traffic management and visitors walking along an unlit Saint Hill Road in dark clothing was a cause for concern.

Protesters

36. On 10 April 2025, Council Officers met with a group of protesters who attended either or both the 2023 or 2024 IAS events. The notes of the meeting with protesters are at **Appendix K**. The PSPO application from Hodkin and Company Solicitors was shared with the Protester group in advance. Comments from one protester, Alexander Barnes- Ross, Ex-Scientologist and protest organiser, are at **Appendix L**.
37. In summary, Mr Barnes-Ross stated that both Scientologists and non-Scientologists attend events at Saint Hill Manor, and the purpose of protest is to raise awareness of the support available to those who have suffered abuse inside Scientology, not to protest about the Church itself or their religious beliefs. In the last six years, there have been two protests at Saint Hill Manor, (2023 and 2024) and they were both in response to the IAS anniversary event. Mr Barnes-Ross has stated that protests focus upon the IAS events because they are principally for the purposes of fundraising and that the group attempts to avoid protesting during religious services. He also points out that individuals have a fundamental right to freedom of speech and the right to protest.
38. Mr Hodkin's letter of 15 July 2024, (Appendix A page 2) states "a few anti-Scientologists have demonstrated outside of the property." Mr Barnes-Ross explained this supports the fact that only a handful of protesters have been present at the 2023 and 2024 IAS event.
39. Mr. Hodkin suggests in his letter "the demonstrators refused to use the designated area," (Appendix A page 3). Mr Barnes-Ross explained protesters worked closely with Sussex Police prior to the protest in both 2023 and 2024 and it was agreed by the police that the area to the south of the Saint Hill Manor entrance, on the west side of Saint Hill Road, was safest for them to gather and was likely to cause the least disruption to the local community.
40. Photos of the 2023 and 2024 protests are provided at **Appendix M**. The protesters submitted they show that in 2023, vehicles were parked on the verge south of Saint Hill Manor entrance along with planters, which meant protesters had little room to protest. These vehicles and planters were obstructing the highway. (See appendix M photo 1) The protestors stated that in 2024, that the Church placed barriers on the verge south of Saint Hill Manor entrance, but these were later removed by WSCCHA at the request of protesters and the Police as these were obstructing the highway. (See appendix M photo 2). This gave protesters a larger, safer place to stand and protest. The protesters have indicated that they want to stand opposite the Saint Hill Manor entrance as this would mean they were the furthest away from visitors, but this is not possible due to large trees being planted on the verge. (See appendix B(a) photo 4 a & b at page 6). The protesters state that Sussex Police use a dynamic risk assessment on each day of the protest, to identify and agree with protesters where they will stand based on the safest place available at that time.

41. The Church wish the protesters to stand along the wall at Rockwood Park. The Rockwood Park area is shown at appendix M photo number 4. The Protesters consider this an unsafe area to stand, due to the verge being much smaller and being private land owned by Scientologists. It is also next to a residential building, which means a protest is likely to cause more disruption. In addition, visitors to the IAS who park at Fonthill, Coombe Hill Road, must walk past Rockwood Park, so will be in closer proximity to protesters, (see appendix B(a) map 2) which the protesters do not think is desirable for visitors. Mr Barnes-Ross explained the safest area for protesters to stand is on the verge to the south of the entrance to Saint Hill, where they stood in 2023 and in 2024 with the agreement of Sussex Police. (See appendix M photo 2b)
42. The same protest signage and messages appear to have been displayed in both 2023 and 2024, as evidenced by photos and livestreaming of the protests. There were, however, more protesters in 2023 than 2024. The live stream footage of the 2023 and 2024 protests can be accessed on the links here:

2023	2024
Day 1 2023	Day 1 2024 March
Day 2 2023	Day 1 2024 Live
Day 3 2023	Day 2 2024
	Day 3 2024

43. Mr Barnes-Ross stated, their first priority was public safety, including those attending the IAS event, followed by communicating their message in a peaceful manner. He indicated that protesters will always follow Police instructions on where to stand. He went on to note that the Police have powers of arrest, but it has not been necessary to use that power as the protesters comply with the Police’s direction.
44. Mr Barnes-Ross stated that he always engages with the Police in advance of the protest, explaining the protest plans. Mr Barnes-Ross stated that he attempts to engage with the Scientology community in advance of the IAS event, but the dates are not published sufficiently in advance and the Church do not respond to his emails. The protesters always carry out a site visit with Police to agree where to stand in advance.
45. The protestors stated that after each protest the Police have commented that the protesters were peaceful and there were no issues. They provided video extracts of Police at the end of each protest giving their opinion on behaviors, which are linked here: [Footage 25.10.24](#), [Footage 26.10.24](#) and [Footage 27.10.24](#)
46. Mr Barnes-Ross noted legally protesters have a right to protest on public land, at any time and would therefore be reluctant to specify in advance a designated area as this contradicts freedom of assembly. They would be willing to stand on an area as mutually agreed between the Police and the protestors on the day of the protest as has been the case in 2023 and 2024. Protesters emphasized their collaborative relationship with the Police and highlighted their protest website promotes peaceful protesting. They drew attention to the fact they have drawn up and adopted peaceful protest rules, which are displayed on their website. Anyone attending their protests is asked to agree to abide by these rules. The first rule is “do not shout abuse at scientologists”. Extracts from the IAS Protest website are linked [here](#). Printouts from the website including the protest rules adopted by the protesters as displayed on their website, are also available at pages 9 and 10 of **Appendix N**.

47. The protesters stated that protest preparations include regular emails and phone calls between participants and the Police with sharing relevant information (number of protestors, timings of the protests) and site visits. Mr Barnes-Ross confirmed the Police are emailed a copy of the protestor plans prior to any event and they have a 'register interest' form on their website which captures relevant information which is shared with the Police to help with planning and event resourcing.
48. In 2023, following complaints from the Church that the content of their signage was offensive, they reviewed signage with the Police and the Police agreed the signage was acceptable. Agreed banners are [here](#). (This are also shown at Appendix N from page 13.) The protestors pointed out that the banners displayed do not call for an outright ban on Scientology, nor suggest that persons who practise in accordance with its ideologies, customs and teachings should be "hated". For example, they do not say "Scientology must end" they say "abuse in Scientology must end".
49. The Church's request for a PSPO of 15 July 2024 (appendix A) alleged that in 2023 protestors were 'offensive, rude and unpleasant.' The Protesters state the live stream footage of the 2023 IAS event does not support this. Mr Barnes-Ross explained that something being 'offensive' does not necessarily mean it is anti-social or illegal and the fact that some people were offended by a protest does not suggest the protest activity should be banned or restricted. He pointed out that protesting is protected under freedom of speech.
50. The protesters confirmed that they will not stop filming the IAS event because they say it is a fundamental right to take photographs in public places such as the public highway. They note visitors also have the right to privacy. Protesters stated it was important to have live streaming coverage as it prompts awareness, raises money for support and resources, and safeguards the protestors from allegations. The protestors stated that they always give a warning before they start filming at a protest and carry signage to explain they are streaming on YouTube. See Protest Banners – IAS Protest – United Against Scientology Abuse (Appendix N page 13). Mr Barnes-Ross said protesters do approach visitors to the IAS only to offer leaflets offering help for visitors to leave the Church, but do not force cameras into car windows to film children. He stated that no video evidence of them filming children or others through car windows has been provided.

Church

51. On 28 April 2025, Council Officers met representatives of the Church of Scientology. Mr Hodkin of Hodkin and Company Solicitors attended with other representatives of the Church. The notes from the meeting are at **Appendix O**.
52. Statements had been received from attendees of the IAS event in 2023 (they were included with the request to make a PSPO in July 2024 (Appendix A). 29 testimonials were taken from Church attendees during the evidence gathering observations by the Council in October 2024. During their meeting with the Council on 28 April 2025 Church members and representatives discussed their views of the 2024 IAS event. The Church handed over an information pack during the meeting at **Appendix P(a)** with additional photos at **Appendix P(b)**. This included the request at Appendix A. The Church reminded officers that Rockwood Park Management Company, East Grinstead Rugby Football Club and East Grinstead Sports Club have supported the application for a PSPO.

53. Mr Hodkin advised it was agreed with Sussex Police and WSCCHA that the designated area for the protestors to stand and protest would be Rockwood Park Wall. Mr Hodkin believed this was a safe place to stand as most traffic came from the opposite Saint Hill Green direction.
54. Mr Hodkin highlighted that prior to the IAS in 2024, the Church with the agreement of the Police had submitted a proposed code of conduct via MSDC to the protestors, including a commitment 'not to harass, or do anything to cause alarm or distress to visitors to the event'. The emails relating to this from Graeme Wilson on behalf of the Church on the 7 October 2024 and 23 October 2024 are at **Appendix Q**.
55. There were approximately 25 protestors at the 2023 event and approximately 12 protestors at the 2024 event. The Church stated that they did not want visitors or guests being subjected to the same behaviour from the protestors in 2024 as they were in 2023 and instead used their grounds at Fonthill (Continental Liaison Office UK) on Coombe Hill Road, north of Rockwood Park and Saint Hill Manor as an overflow car park. This they stated was to mitigate any damage by the protestors by ensuring that guests did not have to walk next to or through the protestors to the south of Saint Hill Manor entrance from the Rugby Club. In 2024 the Rugby Club car park to the south of Saint Hill Manor was used to park coaches once they had deposited visitors in the grounds of Saint Hill Manor. The maps at appendix B(a) shows locations and each site in relation to Saint Hill Manor.
56. The Church stated that the 2023 live stream footage shows a protester displaying a painting of David Miscavige the leader of the Church of Scientology burning in a fire. They state 2024 livestream footage of the IAS event evidenced unpleasant comments about money and an effigy of David Miscavige the leader of the Scientology Church. It was noted the effigy was removed at the request of the Police. The 2023 painting and 2024 effigy are at **Appendix R**.
57. At the meeting a Church representative said it was inconvenient for visitors to have to park at Fonthill and walk the extra distance to Saint Hill Manor. A second representative stated she arrived by taxi to the 2023 event and the disruption caused by the protestors, standing in the middle of the road, knocking on the taxi windows, made her fearful for her safety. Similarly in 2024, she had arranged to meet work colleagues by the entrance prior to attending the event, and again they were disrupted by protestors. The representative was pressed on what she meant by "offensive, discriminatory and disturbing" language that she reported in her 2023 submission. She explained the trigger word for her was "abuse" and she had to explain to her son what abuse meant.
58. A third Church representative said the protestors made her feel unsafe and intimidated and they called out her name at the entrance to Saint Hill Manor. When asked how they would know her name, the representative explained her family name was well known in the Church and some protestors were ex-Scientists.
59. A fourth representative from the Church said in 2023 she had to walk past the protestors with her 11 year old son and there was not much space between them. The protestors were shouting to her son 'she is abusing you'. (appendix A page 14) This was very upsetting and intimidating for them. She said the protestors were not as aggressive in 2024 and she could not say whether her son was filmed or not on either occasion.

60. Officers explained to the Church that observers to the 2024 IAS event noted Saint Hill Road was very congested with traffic and pedestrians walking in the road in the dark. The Church were asked if they would work with WSCCHA to find alternative entrances to Saint Hill Manor to alleviate congestion and create safer access for pedestrians. Officers explained that public safety was our biggest concern at this event.
61. Mr Hodkin explained a one-way system was already in place in the Manor grounds with cars parking on Jurring Field and coaches entering the grounds, dropping off visitors and then parking at the East Grinstead Rugby Club. There was a further overflow carpark for guests at Fonthill (Continental Liaison Office UK) on Coombe Hill Road. Mr Hodkin explained if other entrances were opened, protesters would stand there too. He noted that protesters have agreed to stand where instructed by Police. He explained the congestion was due to the security checks carried out before visitors could enter the Manor. Mr Hodkin suggested the level of security could be reduced if the protesters were not there.
62. The Church representatives explained the current car park at Saint Hill Manor holds approximately 140 – 160 vehicles. On 16 April 2024 the Church submitted a pre-planning enquiry to this Council for a new car park, and toilet block and create hardstanding and concrete slabs for the marquee which is erected for the IAS.
63. The Council asked if an additional pedestrian access could be created to remove pedestrians from the highway. A Church representative said this would not be agreed because Church visitors have the right to access the Church by the front entrance. They considered it would be an insult to the dignity of their religion for Church goers to have to enter via the backdoor in order for protestors to have access to the front of the building. However, pedestrians can already access Saint Hill Manor at a footpath near Fonthill, but this is often muddy and not lit. This is also used as the exit of the one way system in the grounds of Saint Hill during the IAS.
64. The Council reiterated that observers thought the road was dark and congestion mixed with pedestrians was unsafe. The Council asked if some improvements could be made as follows,
 - i. Could the Church provide temporary lighting to assist visitors outside the Manor entrance? The Church responded stating they would not do this as it would assist protesters.
 - ii. Would the Church stop playing loud bagpipe music outside the entrance to Saint Hill Manor as this caused confusion at the entrance? The Church did not consider it was excessively loud or caused confusion and said the bagpipe music was integral to the theme of the IAS event. Officers noted that the Police had asked the Church to turn the music down and this had been complied with. A Church representative said they had no record of that request. The Church would be happy to negotiate with the Police on the level of sound, but not if the purpose of reducing the volume of music was to facilitate the Protesters.
 - iii. Observers noted that security staff were not easily seen in the dark. It would be safer if they wore Hi-Viz clothing. Mr Hodkin noted that and said they would be asked to wear Hi-Viz at future events.

- iv. The Church were asked if they would stop filming protesters outside the Manor. Mr Hodkin advised there were only security/CCTV cameras at the entrance to Saint Hill Manor to monitor usual activity. He stated the Church do not live stream the IAS event. However, it should be noted at appendix M photo 3 a photograph showed two women photographing/filming the 2024 event outside the Church gates. After the meeting Mr Hodkin was asked to comment on this photograph and later confirmed during a telephone call with MSDC's solicitor that the two women were members of the Church who were taking pictures of the events for circulation within the Church community but were not filming protests. Council observers were concerned that some of those who submitted reports (via the online questionnaire or otherwise) complaining that protesters were filming, might not have realised that those two cameras were in fact operated by the Church.
- v. The Church was asked whether its security staff would stop using umbrellas to cover protesters at the entrance. A Church representative advised the umbrellas were used to protect the security of visitors and to keep famous/high profile guests safe. She advised the security company were instructed to use umbrellas to block protesters. She also confirmed that more high-profile guests would not enter by the Saint Hill Road entrance. However, she also stated that some of them have gone to the front in the past. The Church confirmed that they would not stop employing umbrellas whilst protesters were there.

Pre-application planning enquiry – new carpark at Saint Hill Manor.

- 65. Planning Officers from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) met the Church onsite on 20 June 2024 to discuss the proposal. It was explained to the Church that additional work would be needed from experts to progress the proposal as the site is in the High Weald ANOB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and near to listed buildings. Following discussion with the Church and consideration of the pre-planning enquiry, a full pre-application advice was sent from the LPA to the Church on 2 August 2024 advising them of next steps in pursuing the application, notwithstanding substantial concerns raised in respect of landscape and heritage impacts in particular. The advice included several recommendations, for example but not limited to, a) engaging a landscape architect and landscape consultant to design a "landscape-led scheme" and to carry out a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, which shows a clear understanding of the landscape elements of the AONB, and b) to develop a "landscape-led scheme" for the car park that drew inspiration from similarly-scaled car parks in sensitive locations (one example would be Sissinghurst's National Trust estate).
- 66. To date the Church have not responded to this advice or discussed the scheme again with the LPA.

Analysis of Information Gathered

- 67. The Council considers there is evidence to suggest there are some problems associated with this event. Specifically, traffic disruption, the risk of pedestrians walking in the road in the dark, noise nuisance (the Church playing amplified music at loud volumes on the one hand, protesters engaged in chanting slogans on the other); and filming of attendees. It must be noted that this disruption is carried out by both protesters and the Church. It should also be noted that whilst there was noise at the entrance to the IAS event, this has not been reported by residents to the Council's Environmental Health service.

68. Noise nuisance and filming can reasonably be considered detrimental to quality of life in the locality, and in principle it could justify the making of a PSPO which narrowly addressed those issues. However, the Council's officers do not consider that the evidence of these activities warrants issuing a PSPO. The Church cannot feasibly complain of being a victim of these behaviours when it authors a proportion of them itself, in particular the playing of loud bagpipe music and filming of protesters and attendees. Moreover those behaviours only take place 2 or 3 days per year. It could be considered that local residents suffer disproportionately from the use of amplified music, but it is also noted that to date they have not complained to the Council about noise nuisance. It also appears that the Church has in the past turned down music when requested to do so by the police.
69. The Church has submitted that the protesters engaged in serious harassment, causing alarm and distress to visitors. However, this is not supported by the detailed evidence reviewed in preparation of this report, in particular the police witness statements regarding the 2023 IAS event and police and Council officers' observations of the 2024 IAS event.
70. The Church and some of its members have reported that protesters use offensive, upsetting, hostile and/or 'hateful' signage and banners which call for the eradication of Scientology, describes Scientology as 'abusive' and similar. However the photographs and observations of the 2023 and 2024 events show the protesters displaying the same signage which is available to view on their website (appendix N). Police have evidently reviewed that signage and did not consider the language used therein to be problematic or to amount to any public order or religiously-aggravated offence. As such the Council also tends to the view that the language used, whilst perhaps provocative or unpleasant from the perspective of Church members and representatives, falls within the boundaries of acceptable and tolerable speech and expression. Officers do not consider that the use of this signage, without more, is itself sufficient to justify making a PSPO.
71. Whilst the Church and its members have also complained about protesters shouting or chanting similarly offensive or 'hateful' language, this has not been corroborated by the evidence of police and local authority officers who attended the protests. Rather, the police witness statements repeatedly indicate that the protesters were polite, good-natured and cooperative with no incidents of concern being recorded. The police refer to occasional chants of words such as "stop the abuse" and note there were no complaints received from the public. Council officers only observed protesters making comments of a tongue-in-cheek nature such as "*keep your credit cards safe!*".
72. Whilst an effigy of David Miscavage and an image of a man burning in flames were displayed at the events, both items were promptly removed at the request of Sussex Police. There is no indication that protesters would refuse to comply with any similar instructions or requests made by police in future; protesters have indicated their commitment to working in cooperation with the police. The Council accepts that these two incidents may have had a stronger detrimental effect on Church visitors however the incidents were fleeting and it is unclear whether (and if so how many) Church members or visitors saw the incidents or were aware of them (see appendix R).

73. The Council notes that the Church's request for a PSPO in July 2024 contained allegations that protesters were approaching or obstructing the cars entering its premises and that protesters occasionally pushed their heads inside car windows or filmed occupants through car windows. The Council's investigation has not identified any independent evidence corroborating these accounts. Rather, it appears that at least during the 2024 event protesters remained within designated protest spaces and did not engage in this type of behaviour. Moreover, the protesters have given clear commitments that they will cooperate with police instructions, including by remaining within designated protest space(s). This is also underlined by the self-adopted protest rules displayed on their website which indicates there should be "*no harassment or yelling abuse*" at Scientologists amongst other rules.
74. The Council considers that it is a very important feature of this case that the Church premises benefit from extensive grounds, including the overflow car park facilities at Fonthill (Continental Liaison Office UK) on Coombe Hill Road and the Rugby Club. The availability of these facilities means that the Church can choose to open an alternative entrance for pedestrians into its premises near the overflow car parks or elsewhere. This would allow any attendees or guests who wish to avoid interacting with protesters; viewing their signage; hearing or reading their slogans; or being filmed by protesters to choose to avoid the main premises entrance on Saint Hill Road where protesters have been stationed during the 2023 and 2024 events. This would also avoid the need for IAS attendees to walk along Saint Hill Road and interact with traffic. Although the Church has referred to protesters attending at Rockwood House wall, consultation with the police and protesters suggests (i) this location was only used for a short period of mustering until such time as police could safely escort protesters to the main Saint Hill Road entrance; and (ii) police have designated the main Saint Hill Road entrance as the appropriate and safe location for protesters. As things stand there is no evidence of protesters refusing to comply with police directions about the location of protests, or insisting upon protesting in multiple locations or at all entrances to the premises. Church representatives submitted to the Council that they did not think it fair, appropriate or dignified that Church members should have to walk an additional distance into the premises or use a 'back door' in order to avoid the protests, but Council officers do not consider that these concerns are sufficient to justify a PSPO imposing restrictions upon otherwise peaceful and lawful forms of protest.
75. It is evident that traffic management presents challenges to the safe and smooth running of the IAS events. Photographs of the events show heavy traffic congestion with pedestrians mixed with traffic. Visitors to the IAS event were walking along Saint Hill Road in the dark wearing mainly dark clothing. This was considered dangerous by observers. The event would plainly be safer if pedestrians were separated from traffic and if other precautions were taken which are within the gift of the Church.
76. For example, the Council's observers concluded that there needs to be better lighting around the entrance to Saint Hill Manor (particularly given that nightfall arrives early in October and November) and improved plans for traffic flow: see appendix H photos 1c and 1d. Church-appointed stewards should also be more easily identifiable, e.g. by wearing high-viz or lanyards. In addition, the security check point for visitors inside the Manor grounds was very close to the entrance causing a traffic jam along Saint Hill Road. If this was moved further into the grounds this could assist traffic flow and reduce congestion.

77. However, again, the Council takes the view it would be unreasonable and unjust to prohibit or restrict protests solely as a means of solving problems which arise from inadequate traffic and event management, given this is not something which arises as a result of protesters' behaviour nor something which protesters can control or influence. Moreover, whilst other complaints have been received from the Church about protesters 'calling out' to individual members and filming their protests, the Council notes that the Church has alternative legal remedies available, such as under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997, if they consider that protesters' behaviour (either directed towards individual members of the Church or otherwise) was sufficiently serious enough to warrant it.
78. The Council has worked with both Protesters and Church to identify other solutions which would avoid the need for a PSPO. In particular the Council has attempted to negotiate voluntary agreements with the Church and protesters in the form of Voluntary Codes of Conduct which would regulate their respective activities at the premises. Although these Codes of Conduct would not be legally binding (similar to the 'protest rules' already self-adopted by protesters), it was hoped this would assist both sides to build mutual trust as to each other's intentions and future behaviour, and would offer a persuasive deterrent against any deterioration in the current practices and standards of behaviour by all stakeholders during the protests.
79. The appendices relating to the **Protesters** and their Voluntary Code of Conduct are

Appendix S(a)	Proposed Voluntary Code of Conduct to Protesters in a letter dated 22 May 2025 to those who met Council officers on the 10 April
Appendix S(b)	Email response from a Protester dated 28 May 2025
Appendix S(c)	Email response from a Protester dated 29 May 2025
Appendix S(d)	Letter of response from a Protester dated 29 May 2025
Appendix S(e)	Follow Up Voluntary Code of Conduct letter from this Council to Protester group dated 5 June 2025.
Appendix S(f)	Further letter of response from a Protester dated 5 June 2025
Appendix S(g)	Amended Voluntary Code of Conduct from this Council to both Protester Group and Church dated 13 June 2025
Appendix S(h)	Email response of 14 June 2025 from a Protester agreeing code of conduct dated 13 June 2025
Appendix S(i)	Additional email response dated 16 June 2025 from Protesters advising their website has been updated to reflect agreed Voluntary Code of Conduct

80. The appendices relating to the **Church** and their Voluntary Code of Conduct are

Appendix T(a)	Proposed Voluntary Code of Conduct to Protesters in a letter dated 22 May 2025
Appendix T(b)	Response dated 29 May 2025 from Peter Hodkin, Solicitor for the Church
Appendix T(c)	Amended Voluntary Code of Conduct from this Council to both Protester Group and Church dated 13 June 2025
Appendix T(d)	Email response from Peter Hodkin, Solicitor for the Church , dated 15 June 2025
Appendix T(e)	Map from Peter Hodkin Solicitor for the Church indicating the Rockwood House verge where the Church wish Protesters to stand

Appendix T(f)	Email to Church from this Council dated 16 June 2025
Appendix T(g)	Email response from Peter Hodkin Solicitor for the Church dated 18 June 2025
Appendix T(h)	Email response from this Council to the Church dated 18 June 2025

81. The final recommended voluntary code of conduct from this Council to the protesters and Church together is dated 13 June 2025 at **Appendix U** (also referenced at appendix S(g) and T(c))
82. As discussed further below, it should be noted that even if it had been possible to secure the agreement of stakeholders to voluntary codes of conduct, the Council cannot make a PSPO unless it is satisfied that the ASBCPA statutory tests and criteria are met. Further and in any event alternative options must also be considered, as discussed in paragraph 83 and Appendix V. As such, whilst any refusal to agree codes of conduct is a relevant factor which should be taken into account in the overall assessment, Cabinet should not consider that a failure to reach a consensus means that a PSPO must inevitably be made.

Options assessment

83. The Council must consider all options available when determining whether to agree a PSPO. Most importantly they must consider whether other measures are available as an alternative to a PSPO. A detailed options assessment can be found at **Appendix V**.

Matters considered in recommendation made to Cabinet

84. The Council has taken a stepped approach to decision making in advance of making a recommendation to Cabinet. All the information collected, observations recorded and the comments from both protesters and the Church have been considered.
85. The Council have also considered the legislation. With regard to the statutory test to be met in order to grant a PSPO, officers' analysis is as follows:
- (i) Have there been activities carried on in a public place within the authority's area? - Yes (as summarised at paragraph 21 above)
 - (ii) Have they had a detrimental effect on quality of life? - There is evidence of some Church visitors being upset by the activities of the protesters. The Council acknowledges that some of the reports received from Church members came from, or involved, elderly people and families with young children who indicated they had been particularly impacted by the behaviours.
 - (iii) Has that effect been felt by those in the locality? - There is evidence of some Church visitors being upset by the activities of the protesters. The Council is willing to accept that such persons are 'in the locality' for the purposes of the ASBCPA, either as local residents, or as regular or occasional visitors to Church premises.

- (iv) Is the effect of the behaviour on those in the locality of a persistent or continuing nature? - The evidence shows that the protests are very limited in scope and duration. There have been only 2 protests in the past 6 years, each of which has only taken place for 3 days per year. That said, the Council is willing to accept that in principle the effect of the protests may be considered persistent or continuous insofar as (a) some Church members remain upset by their experiences despite the passage of time since the protests, and (b) there is a realistic chance that the protests may continue to take place at least once per year into the future.
- (v) Is the effect of the behaviour on those in the locality also such as to make the activities unreasonable? – Officers do not consider these tests are met. The rights to freedom of assembly and speech are enshrined in law. The evidence shows that (a) the behaviours of protesters do not appear to be as serious as alleged by the Church; (b) the protests are of limited size, scale and duration; (c) the protests in 2023 and 2024 were peaceful and the police did not identify any behaviours or issues of concern by protesters; (d) where disputes arose during the protests, police were able to negotiate and reach a compromise between protesters and the Church on the scene, both sides being polite, cooperative and compliant with police directions; thus overall (e) the protests are being carefully managed and controlled.
- (vi) Is a PSPO both justified and reasonable in order to prevent or reduce the detrimental effects? - No. A summary table of evidence is at **Appendix W**, which should be read in conjunction with the PSPO Redacted Evidence Gathering Table, at appendix G(b). In particular the Council notes that a PSPO will not be justified or proportionate if less restrictive steps could be taken to achieve the same aims. (As discussed in paragraph 92). In this case it does not appear that a PSPO is necessary or reasonable in order to ensure that the IAS events and protests are safe, well-managed, do not impose an unduly detrimental impact on those in the locality, and strike a fair balance between the competing interests of protesters and the Church.

- 86. If Cabinet agrees with officers that all of the necessary statutory tests are not met, then the power or discretion to make a PSPO does not arise.
- 87. It is important to emphasise that the burden would rest upon the Council to justify any decision to make a PSPO and to ensure that its decision is lawful, particularly one which imposes restrictions upon lawful rights of protest and assembly. The Council does not face an equal burden in justifying a decision not to make a PSPO.

Conclusion.

- 88. Overall, the Council is not satisfied:
 - (i) that the behaviour observed of anti-Scientology protesters matched or reflected the severity of the complaints made about them by the Church.
 - (ii) that nuisance and detrimental behaviours at the premises were solely attributable to protesters; or
 - (iii) that the behaviours and activities taking place in and around the premises justify making a PSPO.

89. Further, it must be reiterated this Council has no power to make a PSPO unless or until satisfied, that the statutory tests prescribed by s.59 ASBCPA (summarised at paragraphs 10 – 11 of this report) are met. Officers' view is that this threshold has not been met based on the evidence collected by the Council and summarised in this report. The general principle applies here, that protests and assemblies are lawful unless they need to be restricted in a proportionate manner to respect and facilitate the rights of others. Primary responsibility for investigating crime and managing assemblies rests with the police.
90. MSDC is entitled to give considerable weight to the views of police about the lawfulness of protests at the site and evidence is provided herein from the Police. The evidence does not point to the making of a PSPO being necessary or justified.
91. In principle, protests at Saint Hill might engage s.14 Public Order Act 1986 and/or amount to the s.5 Public Order Act 1986 offence (aggravated by religious hate or otherwise). However, the police have never suggested that activities at Saint Hill Road meet those thresholds. Nor have police suggested, for example, that they do have concerns but are constrained in their current powers to deal with them.
92. The Council considers there are lesser measures which can reasonably be used to achieve the goal of reducing or eliminating problematic behaviours by the Protesters and Church and do not require the making of a PSPO. The lesser measures include:
- i. Continuing to provide alternative car parking facilities at Fonthill so that Church visitors can choose to avoid protesters at the main entrance on Saint Hill Road if they prefer to do so;
 - ii. Enlarging the carpark in the grounds of Saint Hill Manor to reduce the reliance on overflow carparks outside the grounds, subject to the grant of planning permission for the works.
 - iii. In consultation with WSCCHA, creating a new pedestrian access into the grounds of Saint Hill Manor near the Rugby Club and near Fonthill so pedestrians are not walking along an unlit country lane and do not need to interact with Protesters at the south side of Saint Hill Manor entrance if they wish to avoid doing so.
 - iv. Improving lighting around the entrance of Saint Hill Manor using temporary lights to make access safer for all.
 - v. Repositioning the security check point thus reducing queuing vehicles along Saint Hill Road interacting with Protesters at the south side of Saint Hill Manor entrance.
 - vi. Improving the provision of stewarding services, for example by ensuring stewards are identifiable by wearing high-viz or lanyards.
 - vii. Agreeing to the Voluntary Code of Conduct proposed by the Council.

93. The Council will continue to keep the situation at Saint Hill Road under review. In particular, the Council will advise all parties (including the Police) that it will undertake unannounced spot checks at the IAS in the autumn of 2025 to determine whether behaviours broadly remain similar to those observed during 2023 and 2024. The Council will also continue to seek the views of police about the autumn 2025 event Officers consider this is an important consideration because, by making this commitment, the Council is not deciding to ‘do nothing’; rather it is concluding that the evidence base at present does not support the making of a PSPO but the matter will be kept under review in case that position changes.
94. If Cabinet disagreed with the recommendations of this report and are minded to make a PSPO, the Council may not lawfully take this step without first carrying out the necessary consultation on the scope of the PSPO. In practice this usually entails consulting on a draft version of the proposed PSPO so all relevant parties can comment on the proposed wording, amongst other matters. Section 72(4) ASBCPA states this means consulting with:
- i. the chief officer of police, and the local policing body, for the police area that includes the restricted area;
 - ii. whatever community representatives the local authority thinks it appropriate to consult;
 - iii. the owner or occupier of land within the restricted area.
95. Due to the nature of this PSPO it would be preferable to conduct wider consultation beyond the statutory minimum. Along with consulting the interested parties already with whom we have already engaged (Protesters, Church, Police and WSCCHA), a full public online consultation should be launched.

Policy Context

96. Consideration of proposals support the Council’s corporate priority of supporting Strong and Resilient Communities through effective enforcement of Anti-Social Behaviour.

Other Options Considered

97. In order to test and interrogate the recommendations reached within this report, and to ensure this recommendation (and any subsequent decisions made on foot of this report) were as robust as possible, the Council has also completed a detailed options appraisal and equality impact assessment. The options assessment is at **Appendix V** and the equality impact assessment is at **Appendix X**.

Financial Implications

98. There is no budget for responding to a request for a PSPO. Should any party bring a legal challenge, as outlined below in paragraphs 100 and 101, a conservative estimate of costs to defend any action is a minimum of £50,000.
99. The overall total estimated costs to the Council of considering this application to date are in excess of £84,000.

Risk Management Implications

100. If the Council were to grant a PSPO, an “interested party” as defined by s.66 ASBCPA may apply to the High Court to bring a statutory appeal questioning the validity of the Order on the basis that the local authority did not have the power to make it in the terms proposed and/or that the statutory tests are not met. An application must be lodged in the High Court within 6 weeks of the order being made. Alternatively, a decision to make a PSPO could be challenged by a person who is not an “interested party” (such as a national campaigning organisation) by bringing a claim in Judicial Review. Any Judicial Review claim would need to be made promptly and within 3 months of the decision.
101. Further or alternatively, a decision not to make a PSPO can be challenged by way of Judicial Review by any person or organisation affected by the decision on the grounds that the decision is illegal, irrational, procedurally improper and/or in breach of legitimate expectation. Again, any such claim would need to be made promptly and within 3 months of the decision.

Equality and Customer Service Implications

102. To demonstrate compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) imposed by s.149 of the Equality Act 2010 (which requires a public authority to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act, advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it) an Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared. This is at **Appendix X**.

Other Material Implications

103. None identified.

Sustainability Implications

104. None identified.

Appendices

Appendix A	15 July 2024 application for PSPO by Hodkin & Company
Appendix B(a)	Maps and Photos of Saint Hill Road and surrounding area.
Appendix B(b)	Statutory guidance
Appendix C	Saint Hill Premises Licence PWA0364
Appendix D	PSPO leaflet for East Grinstead
Appendix E	3 questionnaires for residents, protesters and church
Appendix F(a)	Police statement 3 November 2023
Appendix F(b)	Police Statement 5 November 2023
Appendix F(c)	Police Statement 25 October 2024
Appendix F(d)	Police Statement 26 & 27 October 2024
Appendix G(a)	Letter dated 23 October 2024
Appendix G(b)	Map showing consultation area around Saint Hill Manor
Appendix G(c)	Summary table of evidence gathered
Appendix H	2024 photos of traffic on Saint Hill Road
Appendix I	Meeting notes of 07.02.25 with Matt Davey, Assistant Director Highways, Transport and Planning West Sussex County Council. Re Saint Hill Road PSPO application.
Appendix J	Meeting notes of 10.02.25 with Nick Hurley and Insp Dave Derrick Sussex Police Re Saint Hill Road PSPO application.
Appendix K	Meeting notes with protesters 10.04.25
Appendix L	Comments on 15 July 2024 application for a PSPO by Alexander Barnes-Ross ex-scientologist and protester
Appendix M	2023 and 2024 photos of entrance to Saint Hill Manor,
Appendix N	Extracts from ISA Protest Website
Appendix O	Meeting Notes with Church 28.04.25
Appendix P(a)	Information pack received from Peter Hodkin 28.04.25
Appendix P(b)	Additional photos received from Peter Hodkin 28.04.25
Appendix Q	Emails from Graeme Wilson 07.10.24 and 23.10.24
Appendix R	2023 photo of painting of David Miscavige in a fire & 2024 photo of effigy of David Miscavige
Appendix S(a)	Voluntary Code of Conduct to Protesters 22 May 2025
Appendix S(b)	Email response from Protester 28.05.25
Appendix S(c)	Email response from Protester 29.05.25
Appendix S(d)	Letter response from Protester 29.05.25
Appendix S(e)	Second Voluntary Code of Conduct letter to Protesters 05.06.25
Appendix S(f)	Letter response from Protester 05.06.25
Appendix S(g)	Amended Voluntary Code of Conduct dated 13 June 2025 (also Appendix U)
Appendix S(h)	Email response from Protester 14.06.25
Appendix S(i)	Additional email response from Protester 16.06.25
Appendix T(a)	Voluntary Code of Conduct to Church 22 May 2025
Appendix T(b)	Email response from Church 29.05.25
Appendix T(c)	Amended Voluntary Code of Conduct dated 13 June 2025 (also Appendix U)
Appendix T(d)	Email response from Church 15.06.25
Appendix T(e)	Map from Church indicating proposed protest area
Appendix T(f)	Email to Church 16.6.25
Appendix T(g)	Email from Church 18.6.25
Appendix T(h)	Email to Church 18.6.25
Appendix U	Final Proposed Voluntary Code of Conduct issued by MSDC 13.06.25
Appendix V	Detailed Options Assessment

Appendix W	Table of evidence gathered for 2023 and 2024 Church of Scientology International Event and Summary Observations on evidence and statutory test
Appendix X	Equalities Impact Assessment Saint Hill PSPO