

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

| REPORT | Page |
|---|------|
| 6i. Planning Appeal AP/24/0056 38 Blackthorns | 1 |
| 8. Budget Report | 2 |
| 9. Outstanding Action Points | 3 |
| 10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025 | 5 |
| 11. Letter to MSDC re DP 39 | 7 |
| Appendix One - Decision AP/24/0056 – 38 Blackthorns | 8 |
| Appendix Two - Working Group Report submitted to PTTC 8/4/25 | 10 |
| Appendix Three - DP 39 Report submitted to PTTC 25/2/25 | 13 |
| Appendix Four – Draft Letter to MSDC | 15 |

| | |
|---------|---|
| Report: | 6i. AP/24/0056 38 Blackthorns the Planning Inspectorate dismissed the appeal relating to the construction of a detached double garage to the front of the property |
|---------|---|

Summary:

See Appendix One for the full Planning Inspectorate Decision.

LPC's PTTC considered the original planning application in June 2024 and responded to MSDC "*Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) objects to the proposal to build a new garage in the front garden of this property in front of the established building line, negatively impacting on the street scene, recognising the established open outlook across the wider Blackthorns development, contrary to DP26 Character and Design. It would also significantly reduce the available light to the property's living room, affecting both current and future occupants, given the proximity of the proposed garage wall, and has the potential to negatively impact on the health of nearby mature oak tree. LPC has no objection to the conversion of the current garage to residential use.*"

Recommended Action

For noting.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

24th April 2025

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

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

Summary

New financial year – no expenditure to date.

With the District Plan currently under (critical) scrutiny, the government's plans for increased housebuilding, and devolution proposals, it would appear more likely that the Planning Reserve may be required in the foreseeable future.

Current Position

| Description | Cost Centre / Reserve | Budget 2025-26 | Expenditure | Balance |
|---|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) ¹ | 4973 | £400 | £0 | £400 |
| sub-total Budget | | £400 | £0 | £400 |
| Earmarked Reserve | | | | |
| Planning Reserve ² | 4995/335 | £4,000 | | £4,000 |
| SID Replacement ³ | 4936/336 | £3,500 | | £3,500 |
| sub-total Reserves | | £7,500 | £0 | £7,500 |
| Total | | £7,900 | £0 | £7,900 |

Notes

1. To meet RTPI annual maintenance charge
2. 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)
3. To meet the anticipated cost of repairing/replacing one of the ageing early SIDs, which are now over 5 years old and outside of the manufacturers guarantee period.

Recommended Action

For noting.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

24th April 2025

Lindfield Parish Council

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

| | |
|---------|-------------------------------------|
| Report: | 9. Outstanding Action Points |
|---------|-------------------------------------|

| Minute | Meeting date | Subject | Action Agreed | Responsibility | Due Date | Status | Date Completed | Comments |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|----------|-------------|----------------|---|
| 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 | 29/12/24 | Overdue | | Email sent to WSCC 12/11/24, Chased 17/12/24, 14/1/25, 4/3/25. Meeting WSCC 3/4/25 - Adam Denby / Andy Tuck undertook to find out |
| 338.1 | 25/2/25 | DP 39 | Contact MSDC to gain a better understanding of the efficacy and import of DP 39 when considering planning applications | Deputy Parish Clerk | 25/4/25 | Started | | Agenda 29/4/25 |
| 352 363.1 | 18/03/25 8/4/25 | Joint Neighbourhood Plan | Cllr Webster advised that Lindfield Rural Parish Council were unlikely to comment further in the foreseeable future and LPC would therefore need to consider its approach accordingly | tba | tba | Not Started | | 363.1 Committee agreed that this should remain as an outstanding item for future consideration |
| 364.1 | 8/4/25 | Working Group 2025 | Committee agreed that a Draft Terms of Reference should be presented to PTTC at its next meeting on Tuesday 29th April, where membership numbers and invitations can also be considered. | Deputy Parish Clerk | 29/4/25 | Started | | Agenda 29/4/25 |

Lindfield Parish Council

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Recommended Action

1. To note the currently outstanding action points and consider any further action required.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

25th April 2025

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

| | |
|---------|---|
| Report: | 10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025 |
|---------|---|

Summary:

This report proposes the formation of a new working group to pursue the possibilities for a 20mph speed limit and school street initiative in the village, following discussions at the 8/4/25 PTTC meeting.

Background:

Extract from Draft PTTC Minutes 8th April 2025:-

364. Working Group 2025

364.1 Recognising the report previously circulated, Members considered the report provided and concluded that this was effectively a new working group considering new approaches to issues facing the village. Cllr Matthews felt that the membership should be increased to ensure sufficient representation for more frequent meetings and that these issues are very important to residents, feeling that an ongoing running commentary in Lindfield Life would be a useful step forward. Committee **agreed** that a Draft Terms of Reference should be presented to PTTC at its next meeting on Tuesday 29th April, where membership numbers and invitations can also be considered.

The report referenced above can found at Appendix Two

Current Position

Name - it is proposed that the Working Group be named 'Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025.'

Terms of Reference - the working group has three main streams:-

1. To provide regular articles for Lindfield Life and the Council's communication tools (currently, website and Facebook)
2. To investigate proposals for a 20mph speed limit in the village
3. To investigate a potential School Streets scheme in Backwoods Lane

For the sake of clarity, working groups have no binding authority to commit the council to a course of action or expenditure. Their role is to investigate issues agreed by their sponsoring committee, providing regular updates and recommend courses of action to that committee. Where a specific course of action and budget, if appropriate, has been agreed by the council or one of its committees, a project group may be formed to carry out the implementation of that project. The working group is intended to be a more flexible or responsive body than the full council or other committee, which only meets periodically and often has a larger membership

Membership - it is suggested that the working group has six councillor members, of which three teams of two members each will focus on the three streams detailed under the Terms of Reference above. To maintain responsiveness, working group meetings will require at least

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

three members to attend, ideally at least one from each workstream. Additional members (e.g. members of the public) can be agreed by the working group as appropriate.

If members wish, the Deputy Parish Clerk can attend the group's meetings and assist liaison with appropriate authorities (e.g. WSCC Highway's Officers). Meetings will have no formal minutes but a note of the discussions and actions should be documented and provided to members and the Parish Office. These can be used as the basis of updates to PTTC, as appropriate.

Financial Implications

None

Policy Context

No specific Policy. The 20mph speed limit, if implemented, could contribute to the Climate Change Policy as it may well encourage more to use sustainable methods of transport to school rather than motor vehicles, potentially reducing emissions.

Sustainability Implications

Reducing traffic speeds in the village should support sustainable travel initiatives, also reducing the likelihood of accidents and injuries in the event of collisions. More widely, they should also contribute generally to the experience of village life.

Risk Management Implications

Schemes should be risk 'positive' in the widest sense. WSCC Highways approval is required, and their analysis will also consider potential risks as the highway owner.

Legal Implications

None for LPC.

Recommended Action

PTTC to consider the proposed terms of reference, membership proposals and agree the next steps, including names of working group members and meeting arrangements.

Appendices/Background Papers

Appendix One – Report to PTTC 8/4/25

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

25th April 2025

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

| | |
|---------|------------------------------------|
| Report: | 11. Letter to MSDC re DP 39 |
|---------|------------------------------------|

Summary:

This report provides a draft letter to MSDC seeking to understand their approach to policy DP 39: Sustainable Design and Construction, for PTTC’s agreement

Background:

LPC’s PTTC on 25/2/25 considered a report relating to the above (see Appendix Three) and concluded:

338.1 **DM/24/2698 – 38 Savill Road.** In the light of MSDC’s Delegated Report comments relating to LPC’s consultation response on this planning application and the Agenda Report presented to PTTC, Committee **agreed** that MSDC should be approached to seek a better understanding of the efficacy and import of DP 39 when considering planning applications.

A proposed letter to MSDC is shown at Appendix Four:

Current Position

PTTC is asked to consider the draft letter accordingly.

Financial Implications

None

Policy Context

No specific Policy. DP 39 does however contain several elements which should contribute to sustainable development and the ethos of the Council’s approach to climate change

Sustainability Implications

It is important that MSDC’s policy is effectively applied to support wider environmental efforts.

Risk Management Implications

No direct implications for LPC however the effective application of such policies is critical to addressing environmental concerns.

Legal Implications

None for LPC. MSDC’s policy is potentially undermined by the approach seen to date.

Recommended Action

PTTC to agree the draft letter and any amendments required.

Appendices/Background Papers

Appendix Three - Report to PTTC 25/2/25

Appendix Four – draft letter to MSDC

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

25th April 2025

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix One

Planning Appeal Decision AP/24/0056 38 Blackthorns



Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) Bsc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/24/3353239

38 Blackthorns, Lindfield, West Sussex RH16 2AY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Miles Lewry against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council
- The application Ref. is DM/24/1256.
- The development proposed is a detached double garage to the front of the dwelling; partial change of use of the integral garage to include a gym, and extension of existing drive.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the Blackthorns street scene, and (ii) the effect on the health of a mature tree.

Reasons

3. On the first issue, I saw on my visit that this part of Blackthorns is a cul-de-sac with side/rear garden of No. 42, No. 40 and the appeal dwelling No. 38 on its northern side and four houses opposite to the south. No. 36 is on its own in a set-back position, with its large open plan front garden extending to the road's turning circle.
4. In views up the road towards the cul-de-sac head there are a number of elements that combine to form the 'open, green and spacious streetscene' referred to in the Notice of Refusal. These comprise the lawns of No. 36; the appeal property's front lawn; the presence of the appellant's mature tree together with other trees and shrubs at the western end of 'Hunters End'; a grass verge on the north side of the road, and the front lawns of the other houses.
5. In my view, the introduction of the proposed garage in front of No. 38 would draw the eye as a particularly harmful intrusion to the street scene. I agree with the Council's view that it would be perceived as an incongruous addition. Furthermore whilst flat roof garages are commonplace in the locality, they are attached to the side of the dwellings and therefore read together with the host building.
6. This reduces their utilitarian appearance which essentially lacks any design merit. However, when introduced as a stand-alone feature, as is the case with the appeal proposal, the limited visual quality of the garage would become readily apparent and in marked contrast with the pleasing appearance of the street scene, which the Council as the Local Planning Authority are seeking to retain.

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix One

Planning Appeal Decision AP/24/0056 38 Blackthorns

Appeal Decision APP/D3830/D/24/3353239

7. I have carefully considered the grounds of appeal. In respect of the need for security, the property already has a double garage which because of its integral design is always likely to be more secure than a detached outbuilding. I also note that part of this existing garage is intended to be a gym, which whilst it may be desirable is perhaps less of a necessity than securing valuable property.
8. I accept that for a growing family, space is at a premium but the house has already had an extension over the garage and the property appears to be one of the largest in the cul-de-sac. Indeed, it may well have reached the reasonable limit of built form on the site without having an adverse effect on the public interest in terms of the impact on its surroundings. Certainly, I consider that the latter would be the consequence if the proposed garage were to be built.
9. As regards the other properties with garages in front of the building, I have noted these. However, each case must be decided on the individual circumstances of the site and the proposed building, and nothing I have seen or read persuades me that the appeal scheme would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. This would conflict with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 adopted March 2018 ('the Local Plan'); Principles DG11 & DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD, and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
10. Turning briefly to the second main issue, the effect on the nearby tree, even though not in leaf at the time of my visit I am satisfied that the tree makes a significant positive contribution to the visual amenity of the street scene and that no risk should be taken as regards its health and survival. I have noted the appellant's comments as to a trench that was dug and the proposed raft/slab foundation for the garage. Nonetheless, I consider that it would be necessary for evidence to be submitted as part of the application in the form of a report by a qualified arboriculturalist confirming that no harm would occur, and an associated Method Statement for construction of the garage. In their absence I concur with the Council that the application contains insufficient information and is in conflict with Local Plan Policy DP37.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons explained above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix Two

10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025 Report submitted to PTTC 8.4.25

| | |
|---------|---|
| Report: | 10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025 |
|---------|---|

Summary:

This report proposes continuation of a re-named working group to pursue improvements in village life through managing traffic speeds with a 20mph speed limit and a potential 'school streets' initiative. Nominated members of the overall working group being allocated to support the specific schemes. The Deputy Parish Clerk continuing to provide the administration / secretariat for the working group and facilitating progress through engagement with WSCC's officers.

Background:

The 'Lewes Road TRO' Working Group has been constituted for several years but has met less frequently in recent times, following WSCC's January 2024 decision not to support a 7.5 tonne TRO restriction at the Lewes Road / High Street junction. Since then, Mr Turner, the original applicant for the scheme has sought to understand from WSCC how they utilise the S106 monies that they receive from developers and raised a complaint with the Local Government Ombudsman, which was not upheld.

Membership of the working group currently comprises Mr Turner, Cllrs Blunden and Upton in their respective roles as Chair, and Cllrs Matthews and Burns, as members of the PTTC.

Current Position

The working group met on 20th February to consider the way forward and a summary of the meeting is shown in Appendix One.

The working group seeks to apply for a village wide 20mph speed limit and a width restriction at the junction of the High Street and Lewes Road. Separately, concerns have been raised about school drop off and collection in Backwoods Lane, following the success of the yellow lines on Black Hill, and whether a 'Schools Streets' initiative should be considered (See link in Appendix One for more details of such schemes).

On 3rd April 2025 two WSCC Highways Officers attended a pre-arranged meeting with the Deputy Parish Clerk on a range of issues, including those detailed above. In their view, applying for a TRO at the Lewes Road / High Street junction under the guise of a width restriction rather than a weight restriction as previously, would lead to a similar outcome. The Officers' view was that it would be rejected earlier in WSCC's process and not reach the full moderation panel.

In terms of a potential 20mph limit, WSCC's Officers suggested contacting WSCC's Traffic Officer to discuss the potential way forward. One of the criteria for such schemes would be for the roads in question to have an average speed below 26mph, above this, greater intervention (e.g. signage, horizontal / vertical deflection requirements such as road narrowing, speed humps or platforms etc) are likely to be required, increasing the cost, complexity and likelihood of the scheme not meeting WSCC's current criteria. See Appendix Two for the most recent average speed data obtained from LPC's SIDs. WSCC would conduct their own speed

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix Two

10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025 Report submitted to PTTC 8.4.25

assessment if such a scheme is pursued. Based on the data from the 20+ sites that SIDs are employed, it is likely that most of the 'unmonitored' residential street also have average speeds

of less than 26mph. Depending on the success and impact of an initial scheme, those roads that do not meet the average speed criteria can be considered in subsequent phases, as WSCC Highway's policies allow.

WSCC's Officers advised contacting the Local Transport Improvements Team to discuss School Streets further. Outline requirements were that the school had an up-to-date Active Travel Plan, that there would be resource from the school to help implement the scheme each day (e.g. teachers, other staff, PTA volunteers). A meeting is already in course of being arranged with the new Principal Active Travel Improvements Officer at WSCC and this issue will be added to that meeting agenda.

Financial Implications

At this stage there are no financial implications for the Parish Council. Depending on progress, funding may be sought to assist with signage and possibly highway engineering to support a speed limit reduction to 20mph but that it is for the future. Given the recent history of expenditure on two sets of consultants, for the 2017 Traffic Study and the more recent TRO application, both of which were wholly rejected by WSCC, critical scrutiny will be appropriate if any expenditure is considered. Depending on the way forward, S106 funding may be available for some improvements.

Staff time in supporting such proposals can be significant and active support from Working Group members should assist in ensuring the best possible outcome.

Policy Context

No specific Policy. The 20mph speed limit, if implemented, could contribute to the Climate Change Policy as it may well encourage more to use sustainable methods of transport to school rather than motor vehicles, potentially reducing emissions.

Sustainability Implications

Reducing traffic speeds in the village should support sustainable travel initiatives, also reducing the likelihood of accidents and injuries in the event of collisions. More widely, they should also contribute generally to the experience of village life.

Risk Management Implications

Schemes should be risk 'positive' in the widest sense. WSCC Highways approval is required, and their analysis will also consider potential risks as the highway owner.

Legal Implications

None for LPC.

Options for the Way Forward

1. Accept that WSCC's current policies are unlikely to support material changes to the management of Lindfield's road network, absent substantive evidence of speeding,

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix Two

10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025 Report submitted to PTTC 8.4.25

- collision data, and a deliverable scheme which can be funded from S106 monies, WSCC's limited Highway's Budget, or within its Community Highways Scheme.
2. Confirm continuation of the working group, renamed as Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025, with a remit to follow through the schemes outlined, and consider any other appropriate actions. For clarity, the working group will make recommendations to PTTC who will decide the appropriate course of action. Depending on the proposals being considered, PTTC may decide to refer the issue to Full Council.
 3. Agree future Working Group Membership and responsibilities (e.g. nominated councillor(s) for the specific schemes being pursued).
 4. Apply for a width restriction under the Community Highways Scheme.
 5. Seek WSCC's Traffic Officer input into potential 20 mph limit
 6. Seek WSCC's Local transport Improvements Team guidance for a potential school streets scheme in Backwoods Lane

Recommended Action

Recognising the failure of the weight limited TRO application to WSCC, renaming this application as a width limited TRO appears to be no change in substance and therefore likely to be an ineffective use of council resources. WSCC's Officers advice is that this would not gain traction.

With several roads already exhibiting an average speed less than 26 mph it appears that a 20mph scheme may be achievable. Similarly, the School Streets initiative appears worth pursuing, although WSCC's Officers advised that several such proposals fell away when the schools realised the involvement required in managing the scheme daily.

In conclusion, it is recommended that options 2, 3, 5 & 6 above are progressed further but not options 1 and 4.

Appendices/Background Papers

Appendix One - 'TRO' Working Group Meeting 20th February 2024

Appendix Two - SID Data 2024/5

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

4th April 2025

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix Three

11. Report to PTTC 25/2/25

Report:

6i. Planning Decision DM/24/2698 – Review Approach to DP 39: Sustainable Design and Construction)

Summary:

PTTC to consider how to react to MSDC's apparent acceptance that it's District Plan Policy DP 39 is not (*or cannot be?*) actively applied when considering planning applications, based on the Delegated Report for this application.

Background:

LPC's PTTC has increasingly sought to encourage MSDC to apply its District Plan Policy DP39: Sustainable Design and Construction:-

Strategic Objectives: 1) To promote development that makes the best use of resources and increases the sustainability of communities within Mid Sussex, and its ability to adapt to climate change.

Evidence Base: Gatwick Sub Region Water Cycle Study; West Sussex Sustainable Energy Study, Mid Sussex Sustainable Energy Study.

All development proposals must seek to improve the sustainability of development and should where appropriate and feasible according to the type and size of development and location, incorporate the following measures:

- Minimise energy use through the design and layout of the scheme including through the use of natural lighting and ventilation;
- Explore opportunities for efficient energy supply through the use of communal heating networks where viable and feasible;
- Use renewable sources of energy;
- Maximise efficient use of resources, including minimising waste and maximising recycling/re-use of materials through both construction and occupation;
- Limit water use to 110 litres/person/day in accordance with Policy DP42: Water Infrastructure and the Water Environment;
- Demonstrate how the risks associated with future climate change have been planned for as part of the layout of the scheme and design of its buildings to ensure its longer term resilience

Current Position

LPC's response to DM/24/2698 stated "*Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) has no objection to the overall development. In the context of DP 39 Sustainable Design and Construction, LPC asks whether consideration has been given to using renewable energy sources, noting that the south-facing front roof could potentially support a suitable solar array.*"

MSDC's Planning Decision Notice makes no reference to LPC's comment on sustainable energy and suitable solar array. The Delegated Report, underpinning the decision states:

"The response from Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) refers to policy DP39 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, which relates to sustainable design and construction. It is the role of the Local

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix Three

11. Report to PTTC 25/2/25

Planning Authority to assess the scheme that is before them, which does not include solar panels. This would not prevent the applicant from potentially installing solar panels in the future and the development would still need to meet Building Regulations standards. It is therefore considered that this would not warrant the refusal of this application."

This would appear to bring into question the efficacy of MSDC's Policy DP 39 and in particular "...All development proposals **must** seek to improve the sustainability of development and **should where appropriate and feasible** according to the type and size of development and location, incorporate the following measures..."

- **"Use renewable sources of energy;"** (highlighting added for this report to LPC)

Financial Implications

Policy Context

Sustainability Implications

Risk Management Implications

Legal Implications

None for LPC

Way Forward

LPC's Planning and Traffic Committee should consider whether to accept MSDC's current approach, which appears to render DP39 at least partially, if not completely, ineffective. If not, whether to write to MSDC seeking an understanding of how the policy is expected to be applied and enforced when planning applications are assessed.

Recommended Action

Given global concerns in respect of sustainability and LPC's increasing activity in this space, it would appear to be appropriate to write to MSDC along the lines suggested above.

Appendices/Background Papers

See

- MSDC's Online [Public Register](#) for the full Delegated Report on this application DM/24/2698
- [Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031](#) for the current District Plan and its policies.

David Parsons

Deputy Parish Clerk

21st February 2025

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Committee | PTTC |
| Date | 29/4/25 |
| Item | 6i, 8, 9, 10 & 11 |

Appendix Four

11. MSDC Policy DP 39 Draft Letter to MSDC

Lindfield Parish Council

The Clock Tower House
Lindfield Enterprise Park
Lewes Road
Lindfield
West Sussex
RH16 2LH

Parish Clerk: Mr A Funnell

Tel: 01444 484115
e-mail: clerks@lindfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk

Andrew Marsh
Head of Planning Policy and Housing Enabling
Mid Sussex District Council
Oaklands
Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

29th April 2025

Dear Andrew,

DP 39 – Sustainable Design and Construction

Lindfield Parish Council's Planning, Transport and Traffic Committee (PTTC) is keen to ensure that changes in housing stock are undertaken with an appropriate approach to sustainability and the environment.

MSDC's policy DP 39 contains several elements which support this aim and the PTTC was therefore disappointed to read "*The response from Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) refers to policy DP39 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, which relates to sustainable design and construction. It is the role of the Local Planning Authority to assess the scheme that is before them, which does not include solar panels. This would not prevent the applicant from potentially installing solar panels in the future and the development would still need to meet Building Regulations standards. It is therefore considered that this would not warrant the refusal of this application.*" in the report for DM/24/2698.

Members would very much like to understand how policy DP 39 is addressed when planning applications are being considered by MSDC. Based on this example, it does appear that despite good intentions, the policy is not (or perhaps cannot be?) effectively applied.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk