

Committee	PTTC
Date	22/7/25
Item	7, 8, 9 & 10

REPORT	Page
7. Budget Report	1
8. Outstanding Action Points	2
9. MSDC Response re DP 39 – Sustainable Design & Construction	3
10. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025	6

Report:	7. 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

17th July 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	22/7/25
Item	7, 8, 9 & 10

Report: **8. 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		See also 273.1 above 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
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
402	13/6/25	Traffic & Transport WG	Deputy Parish Clerk should circulate potential meeting dates for an early meeting to take matters forward.	Deputy Parish Clerk	1/7/25	Completed	20/6/25	Meeting arranged and undertaken 20/6/25 Working Group now progressing accordingly

Recommended Action

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

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

17th July 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	22/7/25
Item	7, 8, 9 & 10

Report:	9. MSDC Response re DP 39 – Sustainable Design & Construction
---------	--

Summary:

To note MSDC's application of DP – 39 Sustainable Design & Construction.

Background:

Minute 338.1 at PTTC 25/2/25 required a letter to be sent to MSDC - Contact MSDC to gain a better understanding of the efficacy and import of DP 39 when considering planning applications. The letter was agreed in Minute 377 at PTTC 29/4/25 and is shown below:-

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

2nd May 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.

Regards


David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

Current Position/Way Forward

After chasing, MSDC have responded as follows:-

Committee	PTTC
Date	22/7/25
Item	7, 8, 9 & 10



Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

Switchboard: 01444 458166

DX 300320 Haywards Heath 1
www.midsussex.gov.uk

Contact:
Steve Ashdown
Steve.ashdown@midsussex.gov.uk

2nd July 2025

Mr David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk
Lindfield Parish Council

By email only

Dear David

Re: DP39 – Sustainable Design and Construction

I refer to your letter of 1st May 2025 regarding the above that has been passed to me by my colleague Andrew Marsh to respond too as the Head of Development Management. It is my team who are responsible for the implementation of the policies within the Development Plan.

In respect of the application of policy DP39 of the District Plan in relation development proposals, it is important to recognise that whilst the wording of the policy is supportive of improving the sustainability of developments, it does not set out any prescriptive standards for developments to achieve in respect of carbon emission reductions. Similarly, the wording of principle DG37 of the Council's Design Guide seeks applicants to demonstrate and consider sustainable matters as part of their design approach, including the use of renewable technologies, but it does not require their use.

Currently Building Regulations set the energy efficiency standards to be applied across the country, which sit outside the planning process and are not material in the determination of a planning application. Compliance with Building Regulations is mandatory.

As such, in the determination of planning applications, we will seek to support a development proposals incorporation of sustainable measures, unless there is an overriding harm (i.e. impact to a listed building or Conservation Area), which indicate that it would not be appropriate in those specific circumstances.

Unfortunately, what we are not able to do, as highlighted by the case you have referred to in your letter, is require applicants, particularly those relating to householder developments (i.e. extensions and alterations to existing properties) to amend their proposals to include measures, such as solar panels, as there are no policy grounds to support such a request, and failure to include them would not amount to a reason for refusal. As set out above, an applicant will need to ensure that their proposal complies with the required standards for energy efficient set out in the Building Regulations.

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

Ann Biggs
Assistant Director Planning and Sustainable Economy



I trust that this is of assistance.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'S. Ashdown'.

Steve Ashdown
Head of Development Management

Committee	PTTC
Date	22/7/25
Item	7, 8, 9 & 10

Accordingly, it seems that Policy DP 39 is effectively ‘aspirational’ rather than ‘operational’ in the context of most planning applications. This is obviously disappointing, especially against the background of the recent Met Office report highlighting the UK’s changed and changing weather patterns due to climate change.

Way Forward / Recommended Action

In the circumstances, it seems that at this time PTTC can only **note the response** but do little more in respect of MSDC’s current approach.

LPC is a member of CPRE whose campaigns include ‘roof top solar’ and has set a goal of 60% of solar power should come from roof top spaces. Its three priority asks include “*Put an end to ‘wasted space’ and retrofit all suitable domestic, commercial and public buildings with rooftop solar, particularly warehouses and car parks.*” The campaign asks for supporters to add their name to this campaign and, in coordination with the Climate Change Working Group, members may wish to consider whether LPC should add its support.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

17th July 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	22/7/25
Item	7, 8, 9 & 10

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

Summary:

Recognising advice received from WSCC Highways, the working group recommends that the Council reiterates its support for a 20mph speed limit across the village and issues an appropriate communication to explain that it is working towards a comprehensive Community Highways Scheme (CHS) application in July 2026.

Background:

Initial research concluded that school streets and safer routes to schools initiatives would be significantly underpinned by 20 mph speed limit proposals and therefore that the group should focus on the latter.

The Working Group has now met twice to consider outline proposals for a 20mph speed limit in the village. Following guidance from WSCC Highways, greater detail of any proposed 20mph zone (e.g. map and road names) and evidence of the support of residents in affected roads is needed, including consideration of signage requirements (e.g. 20/30mph change locations and 20mph repeater signage). It is understood that WSCC Highways and Sussex Police currently have a higher level signage requirement than the 2017 legislation. The level of signage required has both cost implications and, potentially, unwelcome street clutter generally and more problematically, within the Conservation area.

An initial 'four street' proposal (High Street, Black Hill, Hickmans Lane and Lewes Road) was discounted following discussion with WSCC Highways, as it would require a CHS application; being too large for the lower threshold Traffic Restriction Order (TRO) with a £5k maximum but not properly address concerns around the schools and the village more generally. Smaller schemes (e.g. High Street or Black Hill only) might have fitted the TRO parameters but were considered too small to contribute to a meaningful improvement in village safety. A subsequent proposal for a scheme surrounding two sides of the common has not been reviewed by the working group but WSCC Highways have expressed strong reservations that it would lead to traffic accelerating up to 30mph+ just as they were entering the High Street; an outcome which no-one would welcome.

Current Position/Way Forward

The working group has, somewhat reluctantly, concluded that it is not appropriate to submit a potentially rushed village wide application under the CHS by the 31st July 2025 deadline, nor a compromise TRO application for a restricted scheme.

Recognising the level of support demonstrated by the change.org petition which has collected 1,062 signatures and the direct canvassing of village organisations and businesses, which has resulted in 51 responses to date, with 49 (96%) in favour and 2 objections, it appears clear that there is an appetite to pursue a 20mph scheme further.

The working group recognises that any delay in seeking a 20mph limit will be a disappointment to many and is keen to ensure that an agreed message is promptly communicated through the council's and wider (e.g. Lindfield Life) channels to explain the current position and the planned way forward.

It is intended that a 'project management' approach be adopted to set out the issues that LPC is seeking to address, how the proposed 20mph might achieve that, understanding the

Committee	PTTC
Date	22/7/25
Item	7, 8, 9 & 10

resources required (e.g. councillors, volunteers, any other external support) and deadlines to be met in order to ensure that the 31st July 2026 deadline can be achieved, with a suitably complete and considered application to WSCC Highways. It is also perhaps worth noting that there is evidence of WSCC and the Government increasingly recognising the benefits of 20mph schemes where people and traffic mix – hopefully that will also make a future application more likely to proceed.

Recommended Action

The Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025 seeks PTTC and Council agreement to (1) communicate the current position to residents and (2) work towards an application for a village wide 20mph speed limit in July 2026.

David Parsons
Deputy Parish Clerk

21st July 2025