

| | |
|-----------|-----------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 4/2/25 |
| Item | 8, 9 & 10 |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| REPORT | Page |
| 8. Budget Report | 1 |
| 9. Outstanding Action Points | 2 |
| 10. Consultations | |
| i. Transport for the South East | 4 |
| ii. MSDC Village Parking - Stakeholder Engagement | 5 |
| Appendix - Letter Village Parking - Stakeholder Engagement | 7 |

| | |
|---------|-------------------------|
| Report: | 8. Budget Report |
|---------|-------------------------|

Summary

No expenditure incurred in year to date, although new batteries for some of the older SIDs are anticipated to be required before the financial year end. With the District Plan currently under (critical) scrutiny and the new governments plans for increased housebuilding, it would appear increasingly likely that the Planning Reserve may be required in the foreseeable future.

Current Position

| Description | Cost Centre / Reserve | Budget 2024-25 | Expenditure | Balance | Proposed Budget 2025-26 |
|---|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) ¹ | 4973 | £400 | £0 | £400 | £400 |
| Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) ^{2,3} | 4960 | £2,500 | £0 | £2,500 | - |
| sub-total Budget³ | | £3,900 | £0 | £3,900 | £400 |
| Earmarked Reserve | | | | | |
| Planning Reserve ⁴ | 4995/335 | £4,000 | | £4,000 | £4,000 |
| SID Replacement ² | 4936/336 | £2,000 | | £2,000 | £3,500 |
| sub-total Reserves | | £6,000 | £0 | £6,000 | £7,500 |
| Total | | £9,900 | £0 | £9,900 | £7,900 |

Notes

1. To meet RTPI annual maintenance charge
2. For the financial year 2025/6: £1,500 to be added to the SID Replacement Reserve, bringing this to £3,500 to meet the anticipated cost of repairing/replacing one of the ageing early SIDs, which are now over 5 years old and out of the manufacturers guarantee period.
3. Up to £1,000 unutilised from the 2024/5 SID budget to be added to the General Reserve.
4. Planning Reserve – in anticipation of external costs which may be incurred (e.g. reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan, addressing unforeseen planning issues, pursuing sustainable transport initiatives)

Recommended Action

1. For noting.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk
 31st January 2025

Lindfield Parish Council

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 10/12/24 |
| Item | 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Report: **9. Outstanding Action Points**

| Minute | Meeting date | Subject | Action Agreed | Responsibility | Due Date | Status | Date Completed | Comments |
|-------------|---------------------|---|---|---------------------|----------|-----------|----------------|--|
| 469 37.1 | 22/11/22 27/6/23 | Joint Neighbourhood Plan | PTTC agreed that LRPC's proposed actions should be obtained to facilitate any meeting with MSDC's Senior Planning Officer to consider the next steps as appropriate | Deputy Parish Clerk | 24/9/24 | Overdue | | LRPC considered at 24/6/24 Meeting - Cllr Christian Bode drawing up proposals for LRPC, which can then be discussed with LPC |
| 273.1 | 8/10/24 | TRO - Lewes Road / High Street Junction | a) clarify expiry dates of S106 monies held by WSCC b) seek details of scheme of improvements mentioned by WSCC | Deputy Parish Clerk | 29/11/24 | Overdue | | Email sent to WSCC 12/11/24, Chased 17/12/24, 14/1/25. 29/1/25 Highways advised that the officer who wrote the response to the Ombudsman has left WSCC and it is proving difficult to address the questions. |
| 285.1 | 29/10/24 | TRO | the TRO Working Group should reconvene to consider potential ways forward | Deputy Parish Clerk | 29/11/24 | Overdue | | Email sent to WG members 14/11/24, Chased 3/1/25, 17/1/25 |
| 285.1 | 29/10/24 | TRO | whether WSCC would be seeking to update Satnav systems to reflect the newly erected 'unsuitable for HGV signs' | Deputy Parish Clerk | 29/11/24 | Overdue | | Email sent to WSCC 12/11/24, Chased 17/12/24, 14/1/25 |
| 319.2 | 14/1/25 | Transport for the South East | Consultation closes 7th March 2025 consider response at PTTC meeting 4/2/25, finalising at 25/2/25 | Deputy Parish Clerk | 4/2/25 | In course | | Meeting 4/2/25 to consider Councillors' views on Consultation presented at 14/1/25 meeting |

Lindfield Parish Council

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 10/12/24 |
| Item | 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---------|------------------|---|---------------------|---------|-----------|--|--------------------|
| 320.1 | 14/1/25 | Blackthorns Path | Consider appropriate agenda item in conjunction with Cllr Woolley | Deputy Parish Clerk | 14/2/25 | In course | | Discussion ongoing |
|-------|---------|------------------|---|---------------------|---------|-----------|--|--------------------|

Recommended Action

1. To note the currently outstanding action points and agree the removal of any completed item(s).

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

31st January 2025

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 14/1/25 |
| Item | 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

| | |
|---------|--------------------------|
| Report: | 10. Consultations |
|---------|--------------------------|

Report originally presented to PTTC 14th January 2025:-

i. Transport for the South East - closes 7th March 2025

Summary:

Consultation launched by Transport for the South East – members to consider way forward.

Background:

Consultation on Transport for the South East draft Transport Strategy received 10th December 2025.

Current Position

The consultation can be found at [Transport Strategy - Transport for the South East](#) and comprises a 111 page document, together with a summary and the consultation questions. It is also available for Councillors through LPC’s Teams files for Planning and Traffic at [2025.01.14](#)

Financial Implications

Policy Context

Sustainability Implications

Risk Management Implications

Legal Implications

None for LPC.

Way Forward

The PTTC meets in February on the 4th and 25th thereby allowing time for members to review the consultation and consider next steps, if any.

Recommended Action

Members are asked to review the consultation and strategy papers, raising any questions in advance of the next PTTC meeting on 4th February, at which consideration can be given as to next steps, if any. The final decision as to whether to respond and agree the wording of any response to be made at the 25th February PTTC meeting.

Appendices/Background Papers

See links above.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

9th and 31st January 2025

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 14/1/25 |
| Item | 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

| | |
|---------|-------------------------------------|
| Report: | 10. Consultations (.../cont) |
|---------|-------------------------------------|

ii. MSDC Village Parking - Stakeholder Engagement - closes 21st February 2025

Summary:

MSDC’s consultation to Parish Councils and others, in respect of potential options for future parking approaches in the village. Seeks comments from the villages to five questions.

Background:

Engagement Letter (see Appendix One) received from MSDC seeking the Parish Council’s thoughts about parking and views on five specific questions. MSDC have suggested either a written response or an online meeting. In addition to the four villages named in the letter, the letter has been sent by MSDC to other local organisations (e.g. Lindfield Medical Centre and All Saints Church). It has been mooted in recent years that MSDC was considering applying charges to the currently free parking in the village but nothing concrete had emerged. Depending on MSDC’s conclusions, a full public consultation by MSDC would also be expected to take place.

Current Position

Whilst not explicitly stated as the end goal, it is difficult not to assume that MSDC’s intention is to apply some form of charging for parking to recoup (part or all) its costs in maintaining the car parks and providing parking enforcement officers. There is no current detail as to any likely service level agreements in terms of such maintenance in terms of the numbers of enforcement officers and frequency of enforcement that would be available under any new parking management approach, whether this might be fully or partially automated through ANPR and payment Apps, nor of the maintenance regimes for the car parks or High Street facilities.

If parking charges were to be introduced, their benefit to the village’s residents, businesses, shoppers or other visitors is not obvious. As detailed in the letter from MSDC, Lindfield has a number of small car parks, relatively high demand and some complex arrangements for residents, employers or service providers (e.g. the Tollgate car park in Compton Road). Further, a number of residents do not have their own parking spaces and park overnight in Denmans Lane CP, Tollgate CP, and whilst not mentioned in the MSDC letter, also in the ‘logs’ CP on the common.

Whilst managing a finite resource is important, imposing charges has the potential to put off visitors who would otherwise enjoy the villages amenities and negatively affect the businesses who rely on customers being able to park nearby. During building works, there are a number of complaints about contractor’s vehicles blocking parking availability to shoppers. MSDC’s letter suggests that longer stay users could be encouraged to park in the Common CPs during the weekday – although Hickmans Lane CP does not seem to feature in MSDC or their consultant’s research. That is probably a laudable intention but if charges do put off other visitors, there are likely to be less longer-term users (e.g. retail or office staff) if businesses suffer. Similarly, freeing up spaces which may be used during the daytime for longer term parking by residents who do not have their own parking spaces is not likely to be popular with those residents. To date, the office is not aware of complaints in this regard.

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 14/1/25 |
| Item | 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Other considerations for any response might include whether free periods would be included in any charging regime and the potential knock-on effect of pushing parking into other residential streets. Time is quite limited for this response but some sounding out of residents and businesses by councillors might be appropriate in formulating the final response. Any response should also consider requiring a public consultation by MSDC.

Financial Implications

Policy Context

Sustainability Implications

Risk Management Implications

Legal Implications

None directly for LPC.

Way Forward

Response required by 21st February – E&A meets 6th February, PTTC next meets 25th February. Depending on the views at the PTTC meeting on 4th February, options are:

1. Not to provide a response.
2. Arrange an online meeting with WSCC.
3. Provide a response based on the views agreed at the PTTC meeting on 4th February under the Delegated Authority (e.g. Clerk, Chair and Vice Chair).
4. Set up a short-term working group to take account of the views provided at 3 above and refine the response, which could then be submitted under the Delegated Authority (e.g. Clerk, Chair and Vice Chair).
5. Seek a delayed response to allow for consultation.

Recommended Action

Members are asked to review MSDC's 24 January 2025 letter (Appendix One) and agree the appropriate way forward. One of options 3 or 4 above would seem appropriate. Alternatively, an online meeting could be arranged to try and gather more information (subject to agreement of attendees and timing) however PTTC might prefer to ensure that their views are clearly stated in writing, as this is likely to be a contentious issue should the outcome be a charging regime.

Alongside addressing the five questions, as appropriate, it might also be appropriate to incorporate agreed wider views in the response.

Appendices/Background Papers

See letter at Appendix One overleaf.

David Parsons

Deputy Parish Clerk

31st January 2025

Appendix One

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 14/1/25 |
| Item | 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

MSDC Village Parking – Stakeholder Engagement Letter



Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

01444 458166
www.midsussex.gov.uk

Date:
24 January 2025

Andrew Funnell
Clerk - Lindfield Parish Council
The Clock Tower House
Lindfield Enterprise Park
Lewes Road, Lindfield
RH16 2LH

By email: clerks@lindfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk

Dear Andrew

Village Parking- Stakeholder Engagement

Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) is continuously working to enhance parking services across the district.

As part of this work, and in line with its Parking Strategy, the Council is currently reviewing existing arrangements in the car parks it operates in the villages of Cuckfield, Lindfield, Hassocks and Hurstpierpoint.

To achieve the best possible outcomes from this work, the Council has partnered with industry experts Parking Matters Ltd (PML) to integrate national best practice, data, and experience into the review, with the aim of designing management regimes that cater to the unique needs of each car park and the communities they serve.

To help us develop our plans, we would like to ask you for your thoughts about parking in your area. This can be in the form of a written response, or if you prefer, an online meeting (via Zoom or Teams).

Background

We already know that the car parks in our villages have to support a range of different users; grab and go shoppers, drivers who want to do a longer shop, or stop for lunch, or a have hair appointment; visitors from outside the villages, people dropping children off for school, residents who use the carparks because there may not be enough space on their road or they may not have their own allocated parking, commuters, and people who work in the villages.

Car parks cost money to maintain and if they are not properly managed, they can result in frustration, with drivers struggling to find a space.

A range of different management regimes are being considered in the MSDC-operated car parks in the villages. At this stage, we are looking at a number of options including:

- Changing length of stay limits.
- Changing the number of long/short stay bays where they exist

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

Rob Anderton
Assistant Director - Commercial Services & Contracts



| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 14/1/25 |
| Item | 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix One

MSDC Village Parking – Stakeholder Engagement Letter

- Changes to parking disc schemes
- Introducing charging to manage demand and increase turnover.
- Considering the number of permits on sites and the location of bays where they exist.

In Lindfield, identified issues include small car parks, high demand and complicated arrangements with permit spaces for residents, employers or service providers. Parking on residential streets close to the centre of village is limited by road width and many properties do not appear to have off-street parking.

Surveys undertaken in Denmans Lane and Tollgate Car parks showed very high demand during the day, with up to 100% occupancy observed. Surveys suggest there is overnight parking in both. Tollgate includes spaces reserved for the health centre and for adjacent flats. Do you have any ideas for what could be done to increase the efficiency of the car parks and help shoppers and service users access the village centre?

Although surveys were not undertaken in the Wilderness, multiple site visits suggest some demand, albeit lower during normal weekdays. The Common car parks often have space during a weekday, but experience spikes in demand when events take place nearby. Could longer stay users be encouraged to park in these car parks during the day freeing space for shoppers and service users?

More generally, we would appreciate your feedback on the following subjects, posed as questions below:

1. **Parking Challenges:** What difficulties do you and your residents, service users, staff, and visitors face when trying to park?
 - a. Is it difficult to find a parking space when needed?
 - b. Are the current restrictions too limiting (e.g., are maximum stay times too short)?
 - c. Are there specific issues for commuters, shoppers, residents, and local employees?
2. **Parking Discs:** Parking discs are hard to find, difficult for the District Council to enforce and manage, and costly to produce. This can discourage people from visiting the villages. What are your thoughts on these potential alternative solutions to achieve the same objectives:
 - a. Implementing “online” disc parking using the Council’s current pay-by-mobile operator.
 - b. Installing terminals that issue free tickets stating the time limit.
 - c. Introducing pre-registration online for frequent users and others.
3. **Stricter Time Restrictions or Charges:** If stricter time restrictions or charges were introduced, what measures do you think would be needed to lessen the impact:
 - a. On different types of users, such as commuters, your employees, regular visitors, residents who use the car parks, shoppers, service users, and specific staff (e.g., teachers, doctors, administrators).
 - b. By offering specific products, such as free or discounted permits or overnight permits which allow a few hours either side for residents.
4. **Residents' Use of Car Parks:** Do you have any information or opinions on residents and their use of village or local car parks? For example:
 - a. Do many houses lack off-street parking?
 - b. Is there a concern that residents' use of car parks limits availability for other users during the day?

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 14/1/25 |
| Item | 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix One

MSDC Village Parking – Stakeholder Engagement Letter

5. **Improving Car Park Efficiency:** Do you have any ideas on how to make the car parks more efficient and help more people find parking when they need it? For example:
- a. Removing special permit-only spaces.
 - b. Adjusting the balance between long-stay and short-stay parking bays.
 - c. Introducing reasonable charges to manage demand and encourage turnover.

We appreciate your time and thank you in advance for your help. Please send written responses to parkinginfo@midsussex.gov.uk by midday on Friday 21 February 2025.

If you would like to request an online meeting with your organisation or have any questions, please contact Ben Robinson at ben@parkingmatters.com, who will be happy to arrange a convenient time for a discussion.

Kind Regards



Rob Anderton
Assistant Director- Commercial Services and Contracts