Committee	PTTC
Date	23/9/25
Item	8, 9, 10, 11 & 12

REPORT	Page
8. Budget Report	1
9. Outstanding Action Points	2
10. MSDC Licensing Application – King Edward Hall Village Day Committee	3
11. Scaynes Hill to Lindfield Active Travel (SHLAT) WSCC Update	5
12. Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025 (TTWG)	7

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

Summary

No expenditure to date. 2026-27 Budget discussions for PTTC to commence 14th October 2025, to agree proposals 4th November 2025 for consideration by F&GP.

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

it i osition				
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
E	Earmarked R	eserve		
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

15th September 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	23/9/25
Item	8, 9, 10, 11 & 12

Report: 9. Outstanding Action Points

Minute	Meeting date	Subject	Action Agreed	Responsibility	Due Date	Status	Date Completed	Comments
352 363.1	18/03/25 8/4/25	Joint Neighbourho od 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 Starte d		363.1 Committee agreed that this should remain as an outstanding item for future consideration
425.3	22/7/25	20mph Speed Limit	(3) a project plan be put in place to support the working group in applying to WSCC for a village wide 20mph scheme in advance of the (anticipated) 31st July 2026 deadline		22/8/25	Comp leted		First WG meeting 2/9/25, second meeting 11/9/25. Project Manager appointed and JIRA Project Management software now in place with taks and resposibilities being put in place. Next meeting 18/9/25.

Recommended Action

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

David Parsons Deputy Parish Clerk

16th September 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	23/9/25
Item	8, 9, 10, 11 & 12

Report: 10. MSDC Licensing Application – King Edward Hall Village Day Committee

Summary:

Application received by MSDC to extend licensable activities at next year's Village Day by one hour. The Parish Council has traditionally been a strong supporter of this event and this is likely to continue. Accordingly, it is proposed to respond positively to the proposal, as detailed under Way Forward, Option 2 on page 2 of this report.

Background:

MSDC have received a licensing application in respect of Lindfield Village Day, proposing live and recorded music 12:00 to 18:30, with alcohol sales 12:00 to 18:00. MSDC require responses by 1st October 2025.

Village Day is a popular, annual village event on the Common, which celebrated its 47th year in 2025. It is organised by a team of volunteers, raising funds for the King Edward Hall. Over recent years, a performance stage has formed a popular part of the event, alongside an expanded food and drink quarter.

Recognising this, the organisers have arranged additional temporary toilet facilities on the Common, as the nearest (available) permanent toilet facilities are off the Common, in the King Edward Hall itself and further away, the Denmans Lane toilets provided by the Parish Council. Unfortunately, despite selling alcohol alongside its BBQ during the event (presumably under their own alcohol license) the Cricket Club has not to date been willing to open its toilet facilities on the common to attendees of Village Day.

It was noticed this year that a small number of attendees were relieving themselves in the vegetation around the common, although such behaviour is not solely confined to this event. Accordingly, there is perhaps a question over whether the additional temporary toilets for this event are sufficient and / or in the correct locations.

The Parish Council is wholly supportive of this event, which is understood to attract up to 10,000 visitors during the day, making it a significant community gathering for Lindfield residents and visitors alike, with many local organisations and businesses, including the Parish Council, taking stalls. Impressively, the organisers also arrange to very effectively clear up the common after the event, such that the next day it would be difficult to tell that such a large event had been held 24 hours earlier.

Current Position

Against this background, it is proposed that the Parish Council responds positively to MSDC's licensing application, confirming that it has no objection to the proposed one-hour extension. It might also be appropriate to note the apparent pressures on toilet facilities and whether the cricket club should be asked by the licensing authorities to play its part in providing toilet facilities, recognising the alcohol sales from its premises during the event.

External research for larger events serving alcohol over six hours suggest that toilet provision is an important consideration. However, it is worth bearing in mind that this event sees an ebb and flow of attendees during the day, with many able to return home or visit other businesses in the High Street, some of which have their own toilet facilities (e.g. pubs and restaurants), such that the number of temporary additional toilets required is somewhat reduced.

Committee	PTTC
Date	23/9/25
Item	8, 9, 10, 11 & 12

Financial Implications
Policy Context
Sustainability Implications
Risk Management Implications
Legal Implications

None for Lindfield Parish Council

Way Forward

There would appear to be three options in respect of responding to this license application:-

- 1. Not to respond at all / respond with 'no comments'.
- As outlined above, to respond positively to MSDC also asking the KEH Village Day Committee to review whether the location and provision of toilets is adequate. Further, asking the licensing authority to consider the situation in respect of the Cricket Club's alcohol sales from its premises, apparently without the provision of toilet facilities at those premises.
- 3. Objecting to the extended hours.

Recommended Action

Recognising the importance of this event to village life and the King Edward Hall, **options 1** or 2 above would appear to be the appropriate way forward.

David Parsons Deputy Parish Clerk

19th September 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	23/9/25
Item	8, 9, 10, 11 & 12

Report:	11. Scaynes Hill to Lindfield Active Travel (SHLAT) WSCC Update
---------	---

Summary:

Correspondence received from WSCC advising that there is insufficient funding available, either at WSCC or via Active Travel England, to support the proposal promoted by SHLAT. The advice suggests a meeting with WSCC's Principal Active Travel Improvements Officer to consider possible sustainable travel schemes in the two Lindfield parishes funded by available s106 monies.

Background:

Members may be aware of the significant work put in by the SHLAT group since 2020, seeking to provide a sustainable transport route between Scaynes Hill and Lindfield, as encouraged in the Lindfield & Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan (page 47). PTTC stated its support for SHLAT's proposals (Meeting 18/7/23 Item 46) and responded to SHLAT "Both Lindfield Rural Parish Council and Lindfield Parish Council acknowledge the benefits that this project would bring to the local communities and fully support the project objectives. This project is included in the Scaynes Hill Village Plan (2011) and our joint Neighbourhood Plan (2014-31)."

The group has held detailed discussions with WSCC Highways about their proposals.

Current Position

WSCC's Principal Active Travel Improvements Officer has advised:-

"The SHLAT group has recently provided a response to the technical review that we commissioned from WSP. We have considered this response, and the additional information provided and are grateful to the group for the work they have put into this. Unfortunately, as an authority, we just do not have the funds that this scheme would require, and whilst SHLAT suggest that this is a scheme we could bid to Active Travel England for, our annual allocation from ATE for the whole county, is less than the amount it would cost to fund this scheme.

I know this will come as a disappointment to SHLAT, and to yourselves. I am aware that there is some S106 funding in the area and I would be happy to discuss any other improvements your community may like to see, though I understand that any such improvements will not necessarily address the issue of severance between Scaynes Hill and Lindfield. Graeme De Lande Long has recently reached out to the member for Highways, Joy Dennis, requesting to be involved in any such meeting.

Please do let me know if you would like to get together to discuss this further and perhaps we can get a date in the diary that works for us all, and Graeme too."

LPC has not yet received a copy of the SHLAT group response mentioned above.

Financial Implications
Policy Context
Sustainability Implications
Risk Management Implications
Legal Implications

None at the current time.

Committee	PTTC
Date	23/9/25
Item	8, 9, 10, 11 & 12

Way Forward

At the present time, it is not clear whether the whole route is technically feasible from WSCC Highway's perspective and, as detailed above, it seems clear that there is no scope to proceed any further absent funding being available.

The way forward of arranging a meeting to consider possible sustainable travel improvements as well as clarifying the apparent S106 funding available, appears appropriate. Whilst there are no improvement schemes currently identified, it may be that with the assistance of WSCC's Principal Active Travel Improvements Officer some suggestions may emerge.

Recommended Action

PTTC is recommended to **note** the WSCC response outlined and **agree** the way forward in respect of a potential meeting with WSCC's Principal Active Travel Improvements Officer.

David Parsons Deputy Parish Clerk

18th September 2025

Committee	PTTC
Date	23/9/25
Item	8, 9, 10, 11 & 12

Report:	Transport and Traffic Working Group 2025 (TTWG)
---------	---

Summary:

The TTWG has met three times in September and, having drawn up a project plan, is progressing actions towards its goal of submitting an application to WSCC.

Background:

The TTWG is focussed on the implementation of a 20mph speed limit in Lindfield and is meeting regularly to pursue this objective, with a view to completing an application to WSCC in Spring 2026.

Current Position

The TTWG has appointed Cllr Woolley as Project Manager and is utilising the JIRA Project Management tool to manage its activities towards meeting the WSCC application deadline.

Notes from TTWG's meeting on 3rd September 2025:-

Present:

Trevor, Amanda, Val, Amy, Irene and DavidW

- 1. Trevor agreed to chair the first meeting.
- 2. Agreed that the project meetings can still be held when not all members are available to ensure that progress s maintained.
- 3. **Action**: need to set the number of members that represents a guorate.
- 4. Agreed that the aim was to deliver a 20mph limit across the village/parish there maybe exceptions with some of the starting point/terminals but no exceptions with roads within the zone.

Action: Start points to be agreed

- 5. During the project other traffic calming measures maybe be identified such as clearer crossing points/islands the best course of action for these will be agreed as the project progresses.
- 6. DavidW agreed to act as the project manager.
- 7. Initial thoughts on workstreams were:
 - Communications (with residents)
 - Consultation (with stakeholders including residents)
 - Liaison (with MSDC and WSCC members and staff including the police).
 - Speed data collection
 - Process (pushing WSCC to change the route of application for schemes)
- 8. **Action**: all to send DavidW individual actions that they want to see in the project plan must be submitted stating which workstream they should be under
- 9. Agreed that group members can nominate themselves to lead a particular workstream.
- 10. DavidW agreed that actions can be sent to him in any format and he will include them into the project plan.
- Agreed that we should contact other villages that have successfully implemented similar schemes.
- 12. Agreed that the communications stream should include a mail drop to each house.
- 13. Agreed that the communications stream should include a presence at the Christmas festival night.
- 14. Agreed that initially the group will look to get actions to him asap ready for the next meeting on the 11th Sept.

Committee	PTTC
Date	23/9/25
Item	8, 9, 10, 11 & 12

- 15. Actions can be added to the project plan as we progress.
- 16. Group agreed that meetings can be held virtually.
- 17. Agreed that we need get a copy of the WSCC application form for such schemes
- 18. Agreed that DavidP will be invited to meetings when his knowledge is required to support/unlock particular points.

The TTWG has since met on 11th and 18th September and will provide an update to PTTC at the next committee meeting.

Financial Implications
Policy Context
Sustainability Implications
Risk Management Implications
Legal Implications

None at this time but will need to be considered as the TTWG progresses

Way Forward / Recommended Action

PTTC are asked to **note** progress.

David Parsons Deputy Parish Clerk

18th September 2025