

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

REPORT	Page
6i. Planning Appeal AP/24/0044 Scamps Hill	1
6ii. DM/24/2997 The Slatch, Hickman's Lane	2
6iii. DM/24/2966 – 35 Blackthorns	2
8. Budget Report	3
9. Outstanding Action Points	4
10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025	6
APPENDICES	
One - Planning Refusal DM/24/2997 The Slatch, Hickman's Lane	8
Two - Planning Refusal DM/24/2966 – 35 Blackthorns	10
Three – Responses to an invitation to join the Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025	12

Report:	6i. AP/24/0044 Scamps Hill - the Planning Inspectorate allowed the appeal relating to the erection of up to 90 houses [previously circulated] with all matters reserved except for means of access.
---------	--

Summary:

Advice of successful appeal to allow the development of the Scamps Hill site.

Background

LPC objected to the original planning application in March 2024 and again in August 2024.

MSDC sought an extension of time to consider further information received from the applicant however, the applicant submitted an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate, citing the delays experienced in dealing with MSDC. The election in July 2024 ultimately resulted in increased countrywide housebuilding requirements and, at the same time, MSDC was in the (delayed) process of updating the District Plan. MSDC initially sought to defend the applicant's appeal but later withdrew this as the impact of the government's new housebuilding legislation became clear.

Current Position

The appeal has been successful and an application for detailed Planning Permission will presumably be made in due course.

For information, s106 arrangements include Education Contributions, Library Infrastructure Contribution, Total Access Demand Contribution (improvements to the Lewes Road and High Street and/or sustainable transport improvements Scaynes Hill to Lindfield), Formal Sport Contribution (Lindfield Common / Hickmans Lane), Community Buildings Contribution (1st Lindfield Scouts Hut / King Edward Hall / Barn Cottage Community Centre) and Local Community Infrastructure Contribution (Walstead Burial Ground / streetlight by logs car park Lindfield Common / streetlight footpath High Street and Newton Road).

Recommended Action

For noting / consideration of any further action.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

8th May 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

Report:	6ii. DM/24/2997 The Slatch, Hickman's Lane – MSDC refused the application to upgrade and improve the windows and kitchen doors, to which LPC had not objected, reasoning that the proposed uPVC windows will cause harm to the character and appearance of the property and its positive contribution to the Lindfield Conservation Area. [Report to follow] For noting.
---------	---

Summary:

Advice of MSDC refusal to allow upgrade to windows and doors (see Appendix One). LPC had submitted no objection.

Recommended Action

For noting only.

Report:	6iii. DM/24/2966 – 35 Blackthorns - MSDC refused the application for rear flat roof extension and cladding to first floor elevation, to which LPC had not objected, due to it being in the equivalent of Flood Zone 3b. [Report to follow] For noting
---------	--

Summary:

Advice of MSDC refusal for extension and cladding (see Appendix Two). LPC had submitted no objection.

Recommended Action

For noting only.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

8th May 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

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

Summary

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

8th May 2025

Lindfield Parish Council

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

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	Completed	2/5/25	Letter agreed Agenda 29/4/25 Item 377 Submitted 2/5/25
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

Lindfield Parish Council

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

Minute	Meeting date	Subject	Action Agreed	Responsibility	Due Date	Status	Date Completed	Comments
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	Completed	2/5/25	Agenda 29/4/25 Item 376 ToR Agreed Invitation sent to all councillors 2/5/25

Recommended Action

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

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

8th May 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

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

Summary:

This report includes the agreements made in the last two PTTC meetings and details the responses to the invitation to all councillors to join the working group. PTTC are asked to consider those responses, agree the make-up of the working group and next steps.

Background:

Extract from 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.

Extract from PTTC Minutes 29th April 2025:-

376. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025

- 376.1 In the light of the reports circulated for this and the 8th April 2025 meeting, members considered the way forward. Cllr Matthews observed that some council members who were not on this committee may wish to be involved in the proposed working group and that it may therefore be appropriate to consider this issue at Full Council. Cllr Beecroft noted the previous involvement of Mr Turner, Fairer World Lindfield's current 20mph speed limit petition, and that the Lindfield Society may also want to be included in such discussions, and therefore the committee considered how the proposed restriction to six members might accommodate these parties too. The Deputy Parish Clerk (DPC) advised members that the restriction to six members was set out in the Council's Scheme of Delegation for the Planning, Transport and Traffic Committee (Section 2v), noting that other Council working groups were arranged to adhere to the Scheme of Delegation but that additional attendees (e.g. members of the public, other interest groups, specialists [consultants and officers or councillors of the relevant authority]) could be invited in an ex-officio capacity, attending as appropriate but would not have voting rights.
- 376.2 Cllr Beecroft suggested that work stream 3 for the School Streets scheme, should also consider 'Safe routes to School'. Cllr Woolley proposed that the focus on a 20mph speed limit should be widened "To investigate proposals for traffic calming, pedestrian safety and, potentially, a 20mph speed limit in the village" expressing concern that focussing on a 20mph speed limit might be considered by some to infringe on their civil liberties. The DPC highlighted the Parish Council's 2017-19 Traffic Study which considered multiple options for improving "...traffic management, pedestrian safety, and traffic calming measures..." and recommended improvements at eight sites across the village. Ultimately, WSCC Highways declined to proceed with any of the recommendations as they did not meet their (then) criteria to be put to their moderation panel. Based on interaction with WSCC since that time, the DPC considered that their approach has, if anything hardened, making it more difficult to proceed with such schemes. However, the DPC noted that 20mph projects across the County were evidently receiving more support from WSCC at the current time. The DPC suggested that given this background, focussing on a potential 20mph scheme might obtain quicker and better results for the village's residents, than repeating a similar approach to that previously undertaken.
- 376.3 Members considered how to agree membership of the working group and that this might best be undertaken at a Full Council Meeting. Cllr Woolley expressed his concern at the council's

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

“inertia” and that as the Working Group reported to the Planning, Transport and Traffic Committee (PTTC), it should be made up of members from that committee, agreed during the current meeting. The Chair suggested that the DPC be asked to email all councillors inviting them to express their interest in joining the planned working group, detailing the terms of reference, and that the group’s membership could be decided at the next PTTC meeting on 20th May 2025. Further, that Cllr Woolley’s proposed wording for work stream 2 should be incorporated into the proposed Terms of Reference but that the initial focus must be on a potential 20mph speed limit, before considering any wider traffic management schemes.

- 376.4 Committee **agreed** this proposed way forward for work stream 2, alongside the other two work streams (1. Providing regular articles and communication and 3. Schools Street Scheme/Safe Routes to School).

Current Position

An invitation was sent to all councillors on 2nd May 2025 and the responses are shown in Appendix Three

Way Forward

PTTC should agree the membership of the (maximum) six-member working group and their respective workstream responsibilities, as well as the basis of reporting to PTTC (e.g. at every meeting / in the light of progress/something else).

Recommended Action

Following agreement as to membership and responsibilities, it is suggested that the working group should:-

- Agree the timing and location of its first meeting (the Deputy Parish Clerk has details of discussions with WSCC regarding the potential for 25 mph speed limits, which the group might find useful to consider at this meeting)
- Consider whether any ex-officio members should be invited to the initial meeting
- Any other actions

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

9th May 2025

Appendix One

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

Planning Decision 6ii. DM/24/2997 The Slatch, Hickman's Lane



Oaklands
Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

Switchboard 01444 458166
DX 300320 Haywards Heath 1
www.midsussex.gov.uk

Mrs Elisabeth Anna Frances Kerr
The Slatch
50 Hickmans Lane
Lindfield
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 2PX

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE)
(ENGLAND) ORDER 2015

REFUSAL

REFERENCE: DM/24/2997

DESCRIPTION: UPGRADE AND IMPROVE THE WINDOWS AND KITCHEN DOOR.

LOCATION: THE SLATCH, 50 HICKMANS LANE, LINDFIELD, HAYWARDS HEATH

DECISION DATE: 6 MAY 2025

CASE OFFICER: ANDREW HORRELL -
ANDREW.HORRELL@MIDSUSSEX.GOV.UK

The Council hereby notify you that they **REFUSE** to permit the above development as shown in the submitted application and plans.

The reasons for the Council's decision are:-

1. For reasons of their material, the proposed new double glazed uPVC windows will cause harm to the character and appearance of The Slatch, 50 Hickmans Lane and to the positive contribution it makes to the wider Lindfield Conservation Area and the setting of neighbouring listed buildings. The proposal therefore conflicts with the requirements of District Plan policies DP34 and DP35. This harm is categorised as falling within the bracket of 'less than substantial' as defined by the NPPF, at the mid range of that scale. The very limited public benefits of the proposal arising from potential energy efficiency improvements to the application property do not outweigh the harm caused to the Lindfield Conservation Area and the setting of the nearby listed buildings.

Appendix One

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

Planning Decision 6ii. DM/24/2997 The Slatch, Hickman's Lane

INFORMATIVES

1. In accordance with Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Human Rights Implications

The planning application has been considered in light of statute and case law and any interference with an individual's human rights is considered to be proportionate to the aims sought to be realised.

Plans Referred to in Consideration of this Application

The following plans and documents were considered when making the above decision:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Submitted Date
Location and Block Plan			30.01.2025
Existing and Proposed Floor Plan	24-223-PL-110	Rev 01	10.01.2025
Existing and Proposed Floor Plan			15.01.2025
Proposed Floor Plans			15.01.2025
Photographs	Window and door replacement		09.12.2024



Ann Biggs
Assistant Director Planning and Sustainable Economy

REHOUZ

Appendix Two

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

Planning Decision 6iii. DM/24/2966 – 35 Blackthorns



Oaklands
Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

Switchboard 01444 458166
DX 300320 Haywards Heath 1
www.midsussex.gov.uk

Mr Sajid Tufail
Mr Mehrdad Karkia
28 Millyard Crescent
Brighton
BN2 6LJ

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE)
(ENGLAND) ORDER 2015

REFUSAL

REFERENCE: DM/24/2966

DESCRIPTION: PROPOSED REAR FLAT ROOF EXTENSION AND CLADDING TO FRONT FIRST FLOOR ELEVATION.

LOCATION: 35 BLACKTHORNS, LINDFIELD, HAYWARDS HEATH, WEST SUSSEX

DECISION DATE: 7 MAY 2025

CASE OFFICER: CATHERINE CARDIN -
CATHERINE.CARDIN@MIDSUSSEX.GOV.UK

The Council hereby notify you that they **REFUSE** to permit the above development as shown in the submitted application and plans.

The reasons for the Council's decision are:-

1. The proposed extension would be located within the surface water 1:30 flood extent, which is the equivalent of Flood Zone 3b. This is an area that is considered to be "more vulnerable" to surface water flooding and, as such, extensions are not supported in these locations. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, paragraph 79 of the Planning Practice Guidance and the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

INFORMATIVES

1. In accordance with Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the Local Planning Authority has

Appendix Two

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

Planning Decision 6iii. DM/24/2966 – 35 Blackthorns

acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Human Rights Implications

The planning application has been considered in light of statute and case law and any interference with an individual's human rights is considered to be proportionate to the aims sought to be realised.

Plans Referred to in Consideration of this Application

The following plans and documents were considered when making the above decision:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Submitted Date
Existing Floor and Elevations Plan			04.12.2024
Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan			14.12.2024



Ann Biggs
Assistant Director Planning and Sustainable Economy

REHOUZ

Appendix Four

Committee	PTTC
Date	20/5/25
Item	6i, ii & iii, 8, 9 & 10

Invitation to join Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025

Councillor (Names shown in order of response received)	Community Engagement (Articles/Publicity)	Traffic Calming - 20mph limit	School Street/ Safer routes to School
Trevor Webster	w	1	w
Irene Burns	3	1	2
David Woolley		1	
Amy Beecroft			1
Linda Grace	n/a	n/a	n/a
Key:			
1 - 1 st Choice/Preference 2 - 2 nd Choice 3 - 3 rd Choice	w = Willing to participate in this workstream	Blank = No further preference stated	n/a – not available for this working group

The working group should have six members (the maximum allowed under the Councils [Scheme of Delegation](#)), of which three teams of two members each will focus on the three streams detailed. Meetings would require a minimum of three members, ideally at least one from each workstream.

Additional attendees (e.g. members of the public, other interest groups, specialists [consultants and officers or councillors of the relevant authority]) could be invited in an *ex-officio* capacity, attending as appropriate but would not have voting rights.