

Lindfield Parish Council

The Clock Tower House
Lindfield Enterprise Park
Lewes Road
Lindfield
West Sussex

Parish Clerk: Mr A Funnell

Tel: 01444 484115

RH16 2LH

Email: clerks@lindfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk

15th February 2022

To: Members of the Planning and Traffic Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee to be held at the **King Edward Hall**, in the **Jubilee Room**, on **Tuesday 22nd February 2022 at 8pm** to transact the following business:

CORONAVIRUS




Please consider carefully the following guidance before attending:-

- do not attend the meeting following a positive test or if required to isolate
- twice weekly Rapid Lateral Flow testing should be undertaken if you do not have symptoms
- face coverings to be worn within the building, unless exempt
- WC blocks are limited to one user at a time (with face coverings being worn)
- smartphone users should check in to the KEH using the QR codes displayed. Attendees will be required to provide contact details which will be retained for three weeks for NHS Track and Trace purposes



HM Government 

Let's keep life moving.

 FRESH AIR  TESTING  FACE COVERINGS  APP  HANDWASHING

gov.uk/coronavirus

Welcome and emergency announcements.

AGENDA

1. To receive and accept any **apologies** for absence.
2. To receive any **Declarations of Interest** by Members in respect of any item on the Agenda.
3. **To confirm and sign* the Minutes** of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 1st February 2022 [previously circulated].
4. **Questions/comments from members of the public** limited to a maximum of 15 minutes.
There will be an opportunity to speak on planning matters, which are agenda items, as they arise.
5. **To consider responses to Planning Applications** received from Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) detailed in Appendix One and other matters referred to the Parish Council by MSDC for consideration. *N.B. Up to two people for and up to two against each planning application will be permitted to speak for a maximum of two minutes each at the invitation of the Chairman.*

Lindfield Parish Council - P&TC Agenda 22nd February 2022

- 6. To receive reports on any significant planning decisions or issues made by MSDC** and the Planning Inspectorate and to agree any further action which may need to be taken before the next meeting.
- 7. Developer's Presentations to Council** (see concurrent paper)
- 8. The Wilderness – Parking and Speeding issues** (see concurrent paper).
- 9. Black Hill – parking, road safety and damage to the verge** (paper to follow)
- 10. Cycleways** - update
- 11. Matters Arising** after the preparation of this Agenda, which the Chairman agrees to take as urgent. Such matters will be for noting or deferral to a future meeting only.

D. Parsons

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

cc: All other Parish Councillors, WSCC Cllr Garry Wall, MSDC Cllr Jonathan Ash-Edwards (Leader), Cllr Andrew Lea and Cllr Anthea Lea, Lindfield Preservation Society

The next Planning and Traffic Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 17th March 2022.

Appendix One - Agenda Item 5: Planning Applications received from Mid Sussex District Council

Item	MSDC Application Year	MSDC Reference	PROPERTY NAME/ NUMBER	STREET	PROPOSAL
Recognising MSDC consultation period expiry dates for items i - iv, responses for these items will be agreed under the Temporary Delegated Authority approved by P&TC 5/10/21. The response submitted will be advised to P&TC at the meeting.					
i	2022	106	9	Backwoods Lane	Proposed raising of roof and loft conversion and rear dormer window extension
ii	2022	318	Tollgate Car Park	Tollgate	07N3 Silver Birch - Crown lift canopy to a height of 2.5m
iii	2021	4359	Amberley / 51	Sunte Avenue	Two storey side/rear and single storey rear extensions and associated internal alterations. (Updated plans received 07.02.2022)
iv	2022	287	Boundary Cottage / 1A	Backwoods Close	Two storey rear extension and front infill to an existing detached house
v	2022	319	26	Newton Road	Rear two storey extension and proposed new porch to existing front door.
vi	2022	333	15	Blackthorns	Rear two storey extension with new front porch
vii	2021	3292	3	The Glebe	0.5m trellis on top of 1.8m fence at the rear of garden and replacement of side fence (amended description 24/11, amended location and block plan 10/01 and amended fence drawings 19/01 and 27/01)
viii	2022	367	15	Compton Road	Replacement of existing timber single glazed windows and timber door with new conservation style uPVC double glazed windows and composite door at the front of the property.
ix	2021	4373	112	The Welkin	Proposed single storey rear extension. Amended plans received 24.01.2022 showing the proposed depth of the extension reduced. Further amended plans received 11.02.2022 showing a revised lean to roof design on the extension.
Note: Where application addresses are listed more than once with different reference numbers but the same description, this indicates that more than one type of planning application is required for the work (e.g., both a Householder or Full application and Listed Building Consent)					

Committee	P&TC
Date	22/2/22
Item	7

Report:	Meetings with Developers
---------	---------------------------------

Summary

Committee is asked to allow meetings with developers as appropriate, with a view to influencing any proposed schemes to seek the best possible outcome for village residents, potentially influencing design, layout and developer contributions (e.g. Section 106 or Community Infrastructure Levy [CIL] required under planning regulations). This approach would not affect the ability to object to any scheme, notwithstanding any earlier discussions.

Way Forward

The following options have been considered:-

1. Continue to decline meetings with potential developers until a formal Planning Application has been submitted and miss out on the opportunity to influence plans at an early stage, documenting the council's policy accordingly.
2. Adopt an appropriate policy to encourage meetings with potential developers, to provide suitable governance and enable the council to seek to achieve the best planning outcomes for its residents under current planning regulations.

Recommended Action

Option 2 is recommended as it should assist LPC to get the best possible outcome for residents within planning regulations and enables LPC to align with current best practice following the 2011 Localism Act and subsequent guidance. If Option 2 is agreed, the NALC Protocol (Appendix One) will be adopted by the Council.

Option 1 potentially minimises misunderstandings, however it does not eliminate such as subsequent Planning or Public meetings can still be difficult and it loses the opportunity to influence schemes at an early stage to seek maximum community benefit. It is not therefore recommended to continue with this approach.

Background

Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) has a long-established approach of not meeting with developers until a formal application has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA). Any discussion with developers takes place either as part of an LPC Planning & Traffic Committee (P&TC) meeting (the two minutes 'for' and 'against' approach) and / or a separate public meeting for the purpose, after formal planning permission has been sought.

It is understood that the current approach has been driven by concerns over the potential impressions that early meetings with developers might give to residents or simply that it is not worth having such meetings until such time as plans are clear. On occasion, LPC councillors have visited applicants to listen to their proposals but strictly on the basis that they give no opinion and simply listen to what the applicant has to say, with such meetings documented by a council officer also in attendance. There is no written policy for either approach.

One concern, often quoted, is that of 'predetermination'. Section 25 of the Localism Act 2011 addresses this (see Appendix Two) and differentiates between 'predisposition' whereby a councillor has expressed an opinion on a topic but remains open to listening to all the arguments, with 'predetermination' as having expressed a view and not willing to listen to other considerations, being indicative of a closed mind. The former being entirely acceptable and the latter not, such that such a councillor should withdraw from being a member of the decision-making body for the matter in question. Appendices Three and Four underpin this approach with guidance from the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Association in 2013.

Committee	P&TC
Date	22/2/22
Item	7

'Predetermination' does not apply to LPC in this context, as it is not the decision-making body. Councillors are, however, expected to behave in accordance with the 'Seven Principles of Public Life'¹ and care is still required in respect of real or perceived vested interests. For instance, if as part of a planning proposal S106 or CIL funds are likely to be generated for a purpose in which a councillor has an interest (e.g. the King Edward Hall) then the councillor should declare that, and give consideration to whether it is appropriate for them to participate in discussions.

Wider Context

Many councils do meet with developers prior to formal applications being submitted and in 2015 the National Association of Local Councils (see Appendix Four – NALC Legal Protocol) issued a protocol for local councils to use. The general view being that early engagement with developers should improve understanding and potentially allow councillors or officers to make suggestions to improve the scheme for the benefit of all residents (e.g., appearance, layout, materials, and other local enhancements potentially spanning village noticeboards, cycleways etc).

Research within the clerk's network (an informal grouping of clerks) obtained nine responses, with seven councils undertaking such discussions and two against doing so. More locally, Lindfield Rural Parish Council adopt a similar approach to LPC, whilst Haywards Heath Town Council, Cuckfield Parish Council and indeed MSDC Ward members, do meet with developers prior to formal applications being submitted. Further, the Head of Regulatory Services, Monitoring Officer and Solicitor to MSDC, has confirmed that 'predetermination' only applies to the decision-making body which is not the Parish Council who are statutory consultees on planning applications.

A common approach is for a small group of councillors (e.g., two to four) to meet with the developer and follow the guidance given in the NALC protocol (Appendix One). It would seem appropriate for the attendance at each such meetings to be agreed by a P&TC meeting and to ordinarily include at least the Chair and Vice Chair of P&TC. By adopting an appropriate policy, the governance for such pre-application discussions is made clear for all concerned.

Budget

No financial resources required, although potentially some office resource implications but considered to be manageable.

Conclusion

Whilst there are examples of where such pre-application meetings have also seen highly emotive subsequent discussions, that is always likely to be the case with material applications, whether or not such pre-application meetings take place. More positively, such meetings allow councillors to better understand any proposal by asking whatever questions they consider to be appropriate and to offer views, without commitment, on the suitability of the proposal, finishes etc and how they might fit any Local Plan. Neither councils nor councillors are bound by any views given, as they can modify their opinion in the light of subsequent information, indeed that is precisely what s25 of the Localism Act 2011 encourages.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

28th January 2022

¹ See <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-7-principles-of-public-life/the-7-principles-of-public-life--2>

Lindfield Parish Council

Committee	P&TC
Date	22/2/22
Item	7

Committee	tba
Date	6 th January 2022
Item	tba

Appendix One - NALC Legal Protocol for dealing with developers in respect of pre-planning application developments¹

- The developer must provide information about the proposed development affecting the Parish area in writing
- Even if the developer considers that information provided to a local council is sensitive, this will not require the council to treat it as confidential. From the outset, the developer must identify information they want to be treated as confidential and explain the reasons in writing. If the developer has a legitimate expectation for confidentiality about the proposed development, the council will keep a written record of the confidential and non-confidential issues.
- Information held by a local council about a proposed development is subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
- Communications (including informal and formal meetings) between the developer and local council (or with individual councillors and staff) about a pre-planning application development will not bind the council to making a particular decision. Any views expressed are, at best, provisional because not all of the relevant information will be available to the council and formal consultations will not have taken place.
- Informal meetings and telephone conversations between a developer and individual councillors or staff will be documented in writing and are subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Council staff will arrange and attend meetings between councillors and developers and in all cases will send a follow-up letter containing minutes of the meeting.
- The meetings of a local council and its committees are open to the public (Section 1(1) Public Bodies (Admission to meetings) Act 1960) and developers may attend.
- The developer may not speak at a council or committee meeting unless they are invited to address the meeting or have an opportunity to do so during the part of the meeting designated for public participation. The developer may regard information about the proposed development as either confidential or 'sensitive' and therefore not suitable for discussion at a meeting open to the public. However, it is the councillors at the council or committee meeting who will decide if there are grounds to exclude the public from the meeting when the proposed development is being discussed and considered. A local council or committee meeting may exclude the public if publicity about a matter being considered at the meeting would prejudice the public interest due to its confidentiality or for other special reasons (section 1(2) Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960).
- The minutes of council, committee and sub-committee meetings which record the decisions made at them are available to all via the council's publication scheme, a requirement of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
- The Council may invite developers to attend an assembly of the parish meeting, which is also open to the public (Section 1(1) Public Bodies (Admission to meetings) Act 1960), to present or discuss their proposals for a proposed development affecting the parish area.
- It is an offence under section 1 Bribery Act 2010 for a developer or his agent to promise or give a financial or other advantage to a local council with the expectation of an improper consideration of a planning application. If the developer is an organisation, for example a charity or company, the council may request sight of the developer's anti-bribery policy.

In attending a meeting on behalf of Lindfield Parish Council with.....
 prior to a formal planning application being submitted to Mid Sussex District Council (the Local Planning Authority), I understand the protocol set out above and my obligations set out in the Seven Principles of Public Life.
 Date.....

Councillor Name	Signature

A copy of this protocol will be sent to the developer concerned and their acknowledgement of its requirements obtained before any meeting takes place.

Committee	tba
Date	6 th January 2022
Item	tba

Appendix Two – Section 25 of the Localism Act 2011



Localism Act 2011

2011 CHAPTER 20

PART 1

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

CHAPTER 6

PREDETERMINATION

25 Prior indications of view of a matter not to amount to predetermination etc

(1) Subsection (2) applies if—

- (a) as a result of an allegation of bias or predetermination, or otherwise, there is an issue about the validity of a decision of a relevant authority, and
- (b) it is relevant to that issue whether the decision-maker, or any of the decisionmakers, had or appeared to have had a closed mind (to any extent) when making the decision.

(2) A decision-maker is not to be taken to have had, or to have appeared to have had, a closed mind when making the decision just because—

- (a) the decision-maker had previously done anything that directly or indirectly indicated what view the decision-maker took, or would or might take, in relation to a matter, and
- (b) the matter was relevant to the decision.

(3) Subsection (2) applies in relation to a decision-maker only if that decision-maker—

- (a) is a member (whether elected or not) of the relevant authority, or (b) is a co-opted member of that authority.

(4) In this section—

- (a) is a member of any committee or sub-committee of the authority, or

Committee	tba
Date	6 th January 2022
Item	tba

Appendix Two – Section 25 of the Localism Act 2011

(b) is a member of, and represents the authority on, any joint committee or joint sub-committee of the authority, and who is entitled to vote on any question which falls to be decided at any meeting of the committee or sub-committee;

“decision”, in relation to a relevant authority, means a decision made in discharging functions of the authority, functions of the authority’s executive, functions of a committee of the authority or functions of an officer of the authority (including decisions made in the discharge of any of those functions otherwise than by the person to whom the function was originally given);

“elected mayor” has the meaning given by section 9H or 39 of the Local Government Act 2000;

“member”—

(a) in relation to the Greater London Authority, means the Mayor of London or a London Assembly member, and

(b) in relation to a county council, district council, county borough council or London borough council, includes an elected mayor of the council;

“relevant authority” means—

(a) a county council,

(b) a district council,

(c) a county borough council,

(d) a London borough council,

(e) the Common Council of the City of London,

(f) the Greater London Authority,

(g) a National Park authority,

(h) the Broads Authority,

(i) the Council of the Isles of Scilly,

(j) a parish council, or

(k) a community council.

(5) This section applies only to decisions made after this section comes into force, but the reference in subsection (2)(a) to anything previously done includes things done before this section comes into force.

Committee	tba
Date	6 th January 2022
Item	tba

Appendix Three - Department for Communities and Local Government's view



Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU

Tel: 0303 444 3460 Fax: 020 7828 4903

Councillor David Burbage
Leader,
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Town Hall, St Ives Road
Maidenhead SL6 1RF

E-Mail: brandon.lewis@communities.gsi.gov.uk
www.communities.gov.uk

Our Ref: BL/MP/007638/13
Your Ref: DB/JB00070103130007
01 May 2013

Dear David

PREDETERMINATION, BIAS AND ADVICE FROM MONITORING OFFICERS

Thank you for your letter seeking my views on an advice notes from Monitoring Officers to councillors, and how this interacts with the Localism Act. Whilst Ministers cannot give formal legal advice (on advice), I am happy to provide my informal view.

Under the last Administration, the Standards Board regime undermined freedom of speech in local government. This was compounded by a further gold-plating of pre-determination rules, fuelled by misconceptions about the flawed regime, going far beyond what was reasonable or legally necessary.

The Localism Act 2011 has abolished the Standards Board regime, and has also clarified the position with regard to pre-determination and bias. Section 25 clarifies that a councillor is not to be regarded as being unable to act fairly or without bias if they participate in a decision on a matter simply because they have previously expressed a view or campaigned on it. The effect is that councillors may campaign and represent their constituents – and then speak and vote on those issues – without fear of breaking the rules on pre-determination.

In this context, I feel that blanket advice which states that councillors cannot participate in a meeting purely because there is merely a 'perception of bias' or 'risk of bias' is potentially wrong. It will, of course, depend on the individual circumstances, but the flexibilities and freedoms laid out in Section 25 may apply.

It is worth drawing a distinction between **pre-determination** and **pre-disposition**. Councillors should not have a closed mind when they make a decision, as decisions taken by those with pre-determined views are vulnerable to successful legal challenge.¹

¹ Incidentally, where a councillor has a predetermined view because of having a disclosable pecuniary interest in an item of council business, our guide for councillors makes clear that they may not participate in any discussion or vote and that they should leave the room if their continued presence is incompatible with their council's code of conduct or the Seven Principles of Public Life.

Committee	tba
Date	6 th January 2022
Item	tba

Appendix Three - Department for Communities and Local Government's view

However, before the meeting, councillors may legitimately be publicly pre-disposed to take a particular stance. This can include, for example, previously stated political views or manifesto commitments.

At the decision-making meeting, councillors should carefully consider all the evidence that is put before them and must be prepared to modify or change their initial view in the light of the arguments and evidence presented. Then they must make their final decision at the meeting with an open mind based on all the evidence. Such a fair hearing is particularly important on quasi-judicial matters, like planning or licensing.

More broadly, monitoring officers can offer advice to councillors. But the final decision about whether it is right to participate in discussion or voting remains one for elected members. Councillors should take decisions with full consciousness of the consequences of their actions. I hope the Localism Act has injected some common sense whilst allowing for genuine debate, freedom of speech and democratic representation.

I hope this is of assistance. Further to your suggestion in your original letter, I am placing this letter on my department's website in case it may assist councillors in other local authorities.

BRANDON LEWIS MP

Committee	tba
Date	6 th January 2022
Item	tba

Appendix Four - LGA advice

Predisposition, predetermination, or bias

Members of a planning committee, Local Plan steering group (or full Council when the local plan is being considered) need to avoid any appearance of bias or of having predetermined their views before taking a decision on a planning application or on planning policies.

The courts have sought to distinguish between situations which involve predetermination or bias on the one hand and predisposition on the other. The former is indicative of a 'closed mind' approach and likely to leave the committee's decision susceptible to challenge by Judicial Review.

Clearly expressing an intention to vote in a particular way before a meeting (predetermination) is different from where a councillor makes it clear they are willing to listen to all the considerations presented at the committee before deciding on how to vote (predisposition). The latter is alright, the former is not and may result in a Court quashing such planning decisions.

Section 25 of the Act also provides that a councillor should not be regarded as having a closed mind simply because they previously did or said something that, directly or indirectly, indicated what view they might take in relation to any particular matter.

This reflects the common law position that a councillor may be predisposed on a matter before it comes to Committee, provided they remain open to listening to all the arguments and changing their mind in light of all the information presented at the meeting. Nevertheless, a councillor in this position will always be judged against an objective test of whether the reasonable onlooker, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would consider that the councillor was biased.

For example, a councillor who states "Windfarms are blots on the landscape and I will oppose each and every windfarm application that comes before the committee" will be perceived very differently from a councillor who states: "Many people find windfarms ugly and noisy and I will need a lot of persuading that any more windfarms should be allowed in our area."

If a councillor has predetermined their position, they should withdraw from being a member of the decision-making body for that matter.

This would apply to any member of the planning committee who wanted to speak for or against a proposal, as a campaigner (for example on a proposal within their ward). If the Council rules allow substitutes to the meeting, this could be an appropriate option.

Source: Probity in Planning for councillors and officers LGA Nov 2013

See also Section 4 of [The Pre-application Suite](#) published by the LGA June 2014

Committee	P&TC
Date	22/2/22
Item	8

Report:	The Wilderness – parking and speeding issues
---------	---

Summary

Invitation from residents of The Wilderness to meet Councillors on site in respect of concerns over traffic speeds, inappropriate parking, faded yellow lines and the potential for an accident.

Way Forward

The following options have been considered:-

1. Advise the residents to liaise directly with WSCC as the Highways authority / seek the ward Member's input (Cllr Garry Wall)
2. Advise the residents to report to MSDC vehicles parked inappropriately – this action has already been undertaken by the Parish office
3. Two or more Councillors and the Deputy Parish Clerk to meet with residents at the site to consider the issues and report back to Planning & Traffic Committee to consider any other steps. Recognising that LPC is unable to directly implement any changes to Highways arrangements, this would be more an exploratory visit to hear the residents pending any approaches to WSCC.

Recommended Action

1. Meet on site with residents
2. Depending on findings and future P&TC discussion, consider further action.

Background

It appears that meetings with residents, LPC and WSCC sometime in the past culminated in yellow lines (See Appendix One WSCC TRO details) being put in place with a view to keeping this narrow section of road clear.

Current Position

The residents are however concerned that fading of the yellow lines, and / or vehicles parking despite their presence, is contributing to vehicles approaching each other head on in the limited remaining space and increasing the likelihood of an accident. As shown in Appendix Two, the residents are strongly of the view that dangers have heightened since the yellow lines/TRO was originally put in place, that the yellow lines need repainting and extending, and WSCC need to be involved.

The residents have been advised to report inappropriate parking to MSDC's Parking Enforcement Team. This should have the dual benefit of some enforcement being applied and allow the Parking Enforcement Officers to comment on whether there are issues with overly faded yellow lines which have made them difficult to enforce.

At the present time WSCC's Accident Locations Map does not show any reported accidents at this location. Against this background and based on interactions with WSCC over recent years it seems unlikely that additional traffic calming measures would be supported.

Budget

No budgetary implications foreseen for LPC.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk


11th February 2022

Committee	P&TC
Date	22/2/22
Item	8

Appendix One

WSCC TRO Tile Ref No: TQ3425NES enforced 12/7/21

The map shows a residential area in Lindfield. A central road, High Street, is highlighted with red hatching and labeled 'No waiting at any time'. Branching off to the west is a road with blue hatching labeled 'Waiting limited to 2hrs No return within 1hr 8.00am-6.00pm Mon-Sat'. Other roads shown include Hickman's Lane, Shernstone, Compton Road, Tollgate, Denman's La, Alma Road, Brishes Lane, and The Wilderness. Property names like 'Cedar Cottage', 'The Barn', and 'Mayrose Cottage' are also visible.

	West Sussex County Council Highways & Transport The Grange Tower Street Chichester West Sussex PO19 1RH	MID SUSSEX DISTRICT: LINDFIELD WAITING RESTRICTIONS	TILE REF NO: TQ3425NES SHEET ISSUE NO 5 SHEET ACTIVE FROM - 12.07.2021	N SCALE: 1:1250 at A3 size
---	---	--	--	---

Reproduced from or based upon 2021 Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of HMSO (C) Crown Copyright reserved. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. West Sussex County Council Licence No. 100018488

Committee	P&TC
Date	22/2/22
Item	8

Appendix Two

The Wilderness – residents' correspondence

I am writing to ask for your support as we again take up the escalating dangers from cars speeding into The Wilderness and encountering, without warning, the cars parked almost to the junction forcing drivers, often speeding, into the direct path of oncoming traffic. The danger is self-evident and the need for immediate action imperative.

Cars are parked now even on the existing yellow lines. These need immediate repainting and, in our view, extending. The dangers have increased since the line of cars is no longer broken to allow access to a garage which previously provided an escape 'gap' for cars speeding towards each other. But it is not just motorists risking injury and damage. This is the route to the Church and all its activities involving young mothers and children. Many are on foot taking life and limb into their hands as they jump onto the verge to avoid speeding late arrivals.

If things are not improved, it is no longer a matter of IF there will be a serious accident but WHEN. We would therefore like to meet you on site to see the dangers for yourselves and support the representations we are planning to make for immediate Highways action before we all have a serious injury, perhaps to a very young child, on our consciences.

Not sure how to word this so as not to appear too threatening, but an indication that this is part of a file on near misses and resultant inaction should this lead to an incident (?).

When I was a [REDACTED], I attended a site meeting with representatives of WSCC Highways Department about the dangers at the entrance to The Wilderness caused by cars turning in from Dukes Road. Yellow lines were then painted at the turn. Since then the situation has become very much more serious.

There are many more cars parking on the left immediately on turning into The Wilderness. The situation is not helped by the fact that the yellow lines are in urgent need of repainting. Car drivers turning too quickly into The Wilderness are causing potentially dangerous collisions with cars exiting The Wilderness and even more concerning, such drivers are threatening the safety of pedestrians, many of whom are children.

I appreciate this is a Highways matter but a site meeting with members of Lindfield parish council would be helpful. In addition of course a site meeting with WSCC Highways representatives is imperative.

I wish to stress that immediate action is necessary if collisions and possible fatalities are to be avoided.

Committee	P&TC
Date	22/2/22
Item	9

Report:	Black Hill – parking, road safety and damage to the verge
---------	--

Summary

The continuing parking on the verges around Black Hill at school drop off and collection times is causing damage to the verge, regularly obstructing the road and there are concerns around pedestrian safety. P&TC to consider appropriate way forward.

Way Forward

The following options have been considered:-

1. Seek the ward Member's input (Cllr Garry Wall) given WSCC Highways role alongside its responsibility for schools.
2. Consider future actions by LPC – potential for a working group

Recommended Action

1. P&TC to consider next steps

Background

To date the office has received a number of comments regarding problems on Black Hill, from residents, parents who don't use cars for pick up and drop off, and some councillors.

From the office perspective, we've tried to liaise with the school's travel plan co-ordinator, and last week our local PCSO called in on this and other matters. It is clear that the situation here is far from unique and is replicated across much of the country but at the same time the damage to the grass verge is unsightly and over time could potentially lead to the loss of the grass. Equally, reports of children running across the road, opening car doors in front of traffic etc brings safety concerns.

Various ideas have been mooted:-

- recommence using the playground for drop off (it is understood that this was stopped by the school mid-covid, not because of the children's behaviour but in view of the parents who would stand in groups in the playground, with no social distancing being observed). There is currently no sign of a return to the use of the playground for this purpose.
- yellow lines on one or both sides of Black Hill – a possibility but unsightly and may be ignored and / or move the problem to another part of the village
- posts on the verge – would need careful placement to be effective and Highways /their mowing gangs would be less keen, as well as wearing them rapidly with trimmers etc
- flowerpots/planters on the verge – similar issues to posts plus would need maintenance contracts to plant up etc and therefore budget implications
- grasscrete or similar to allow the verges to 'cope' better with such parking
- A Sustrans education programme with the school(s?) – this is understood to cost many thousands and the school has advised there would be no funding available from them

Current Position

With half term currently in course, the problem has fallen away but is expected to continue albeit spring weather may reduce the level of traffic.

Lindfield Parish Council

Committee	P&TC
Date	22/2/22
Item	9

Budget

No immediate budgetary implications foreseen however street works or Sustrans type support is likely to have meaningful funding requirements.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

15th February 2022